

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, &
Professional Papers

Graduate School

2011

Cultural Landscapes in Conflict: Addressing the Interests and Landscape Perceptions of Native Americans, the National Park Service, and the American Public in National Parks

Emily Anne Eide

The University of Montana

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Eide, Emily Anne, "Cultural Landscapes in Conflict: Addressing the Interests and Landscape Perceptions of Native Americans, the National Park Service, and the American Public in National Parks" (2011).

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers. 282.

<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/282>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

CULTURAL LANDSCAPES IN CONFLICT: ADDRESSING THE INTERESTS AND
LANDSCAPE PERCEPTIONS OF NATIVE AMERICANS, THE NATIONAL PARK
SERVICE, AND THE AMERICAN PUBLIC IN NATIONAL PARKS

By

Emily Anne Eide

B.A., The University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA, 2009

Thesis

presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts
in Anthropology, Cultural Heritage

The University of Montana
Missoula, MT

December 2011

Approved by:

Sandy Ross, Associate Dean of The Graduate School
Graduate School

Dr. John Douglas, Chair
Anthropology

Dr. Gregory Campbell, Committee Member
Anthropology

Dr. Pei-Lin Yu, Committee Member
RM-CESU

Cultural Landscapes in Conflict: Addressing the Interests and Landscape Perceptions of Native Americans, the National Park Service, and the American Public in National Parks

Chairperson: John Douglas

The Prayer and Fasting Project of 2010 from Glacier National Park produced startling results indicating that many areas which have cultural significance to Native American peoples have been adversely impacted by national park recreationalists. This thesis addresses the significance of these impacts along with other management issues associated with conflicting landscape perceptions of national park lands. These concerns are explored through the examination of past and present archaeological theories along with cultural resource management approaches to landscapes. The need to identify and consider different cultural perceptions of landscapes in research and management scenarios is stressed throughout this work. The inclusion of these perceptions is necessary for the implementation of appropriate cultural resource management.

This thesis also investigates the possibility of multiple landscapes simultaneously occupying the same space. The foundation of this concept is based on the ability of individual cultures to uniquely identify and experience landscapes as dictated by their cultural perceptions and beliefs. The generalized landscape perceptions of Native Americans, the National Park Service, and the Anglo-American national park tourist are discussed to demonstrate the different landscape perceptions that can exist between cultural groups even when observing the same geographical area.

The final aspect of this thesis discusses the effectiveness of indirect management policies to pacify conflicts where multiple stakeholders do not agree on the expected uses of a significant area. In general, indirect management strategies rely upon education and interpretive programs to inform visitors of appropriate behavior towards resources, as opposed to direct restrictions. The indirect management directives found in the voluntary climbing ban issued in 1995 at Devils Tower National Monument serve as the primary case study for this discussion. Although management issues related to national park landscapes continue to be present, it is hoped that this thesis will bring further awareness to these issues while also presenting new ways to address these conflicts and concerns.

Table of Contents

Title Page

Abstract

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Landscape Theory.....	5
Chapter 3: Issues in Landscape Management.....	24
Chapter 4: Approaches to Landscape Management.....	36
Chapter 5: Landscape Perceptions of Native Americans.....	57
Chapter 6: Landscape Perceptions of the National Park Service.....	69
Chapter 7: Landscape Perceptions of the Anglo-American Tourist.....	81
Chapter 8: Conclusion.....	96
References.....	104

Acknowledgments

This thesis would not have been possible without the support of many different people. This work truly is a compilation of all the lessons I have learned during my time at the University of Montana. However, I would especially like to thank Scott Pritchard for helping me traverse the mountain terrain of Glacier National Park during the summer of 2010 and encouraging me to always keep going. I would also like to thank Lon Johnson and Francis Auld for permitting me the opportunity to complete this project and for providing me with invaluable guidance and experience. Thank you also to my committee members (Dr. John Douglas, Dr. Gregory Campbell, and Dr. Pei-Lin Yu) for allowing me to think outside the box and for being ever patient throughout this project. Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for everything they do to support me, especially Diane Pritchard for taking the time to proofread this thesis.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Landscapes have been increasingly incorporated into the archaeological and cultural resource management (CRM) disciplines since the 1960s. However, the term “landscape” has been given multiple definitions through the years making a universal application of this term difficult. These definitions are largely reflective of overarching theoretical and cultural beliefs that dictate how landscapes are perceived. Further recognizing and incorporating these cultural and theoretical perceptions of landscapes into CRM discussions can be beneficial for creating effective management where multiple stakeholders are involved. While the benefits of considering different perceptions in management situations have been made evident, this approach has ultimately raised new questions and concerns to be further addressed.

The importance of landscapes as cultural resources has been discussed by many scholars in both archaeology and CRM. Dower (1997) expresses that landscapes enhance the qualities of human life and culture while also contributing to the diversity of nature, making them invaluable cultural resources. Landscapes are also included in cultural practices that connect people to their pasts and promote ideas of cultural identity and heritage. Aside from their cultural value, many archaeologists use the information (both ecological and cultural) from landscapes to research past cultures. The ways in which archaeologists research landscapes will be further addressed throughout this paper.

The primary purpose of this thesis is to discuss the various theories, methods, and management approaches associated with the study of landscapes within CRM and archaeology. The goal of this discussion is to determine the most appropriate ways to manage cultural landscapes within national parks that are of interest to multiple stakeholders. While the issues presented in this thesis are largely managerial ones, theoretical concepts from the archaeological

discipline will be used as the basis for this discussion. The integration of archaeological theories into CRM is a natural one because many CRM specialists have backgrounds in archaeology.

Chapter Outline

The following chapter begins this discussion of landscape theory, management, and cultural perceptions by providing an overview of the ways in which landscapes have been theorized within the discipline of archaeology. This chapter will demonstrate the difficulties in developing a unified definition of “landscape” and the importance of including local and Native American communities when attempting to create a working definition. Furthermore, the four principles of the recently suggested landscape paradigm will be outlined, which will be used to critique the landscape approaches presented Chapter 4.

In Chapter 3, some of the landscape issues occurring in CRM, especially those within national parks, will be outlined. Furthermore, the Glacier National Park Prayer and Fasting Site Project of 2010 case study will demonstrate the potential severity of these issues. The results from this case study indicate that visitor recreation is having an adverse effect on cultural resources important to Native Americans. While this chapter focuses on this study from Glacier, similar issues are present in many other parks. This thesis attempts to understand the reasons for these resource conflicts within national parks and how these areas can be managed more effectively in the future.

Various approaches to the management of landscapes are considered in Chapter 4. While the focus of this thesis is on the National Park Service, a few approaches from other agencies and even other continents are included. The models presented will be critiqued based on the conclusions from Chapter 2 and the ability of the models to deal with the conflicts presented in

Chapter 3. In general, these approaches are found to be inadequate when attempting to deal with the full range of complexities within the concept of “landscapes.” This chapter will conclude with the proposal of a new method of management that will improve these approaches.

Chapters 5, 6 and 7 apply the ideas developed in the first four chapters demonstrating the inadequacies of current methodology due to the lack of attention being paid to the different cultural perceptions held by stakeholders in landscape conflicts. The new approach proposed at the end of Chapter 4 suggests that Federal agency land managers should identify the underlying landscape perceptions and expectations held by each stakeholder involved in landscape conflicts. For this thesis, the stakeholders from the Glacier case study will be examined, which are: the National Park Service, the Anglo-American tourist, and Native American cultures.

Each stakeholder is discussed in a separate chapter, starting with Native Americans in Chapter 5, the National Park Service in Chapter 6, and finally, the Anglo-American tourist in Chapter 7. The goal of these chapters is to demonstrate the radically different perceptions of national park landscapes maintained by each of these three groups. The outcome of these chapters will also test the hypothesis that the issues discussed in Chapter 3 are primarily the result of conflicting cultural perceptions and expectations of landscapes. Furthermore, if land managers can decipher these different perceptions, they will be able to develop more effective management plans.

The conclusions proposed in Chapter 8 recap the previous chapters and compare the results from the stakeholder chapters. This chapter also discusses the management options available to CRM specialists after they have addressed the differences in cultural landscape perceptions. The Devils Tower case study is also included as an example of a national park

where similar landscape conflicts have been addressed and successfully reduced. In particular, this case study establishes the importance of public education in solving these issues.

The management issues associated with conflicting landscape perceptions are complex and, therefore, can require multiple problem-solving approaches. This thesis provides a detailed look at these issues and proposes ways in which these conflicts can be addressed. Through this discussion it will be confirmed that the majority of landscape issues are the result of conflicting landscape perceptions and expectations among cultural groups associated with the same geographic areas. Furthermore, it will also be established that indirect management through public education is a more effective means of management, as opposed to the direct regulation of activities.

Chapter 2: Landscape Theory

While the fields of anthropology, including archaeology, have long investigated many aspects of cultural landscapes, a collective definition for the term “landscape” has yet to be determined. The difficulty in determining a definitive definition is perpetuated by the many ways in which landscapes are theorized and researched by various scholars. Each scholar approaches landscapes in a different way based on their overarching theoretical perspectives, which are not entirely removed from their cultural perceptions (Ashmore 2004). The contemporary literature on landscape research, therefore, is based on a variety of theoretical paradigms and scientific disciplines (Ashmore 2004; Clark and Scheiber 2008; David and Thomas 2008). However, for the purposes of this thesis, the focus will remain primarily on archaeological theories of landscape.

The first section of this chapter will discuss the many ways scholars have attempted to define “landscape” in a manner that is compatible with the various theoretical perspectives within archaeology. Archeological methods and approaches to the study of landscapes associated with these theoretical perspectives will also be discussed, including the most recent developments toward establishing a distinct landscape paradigm. By addressing the range in which landscapes have been and continue to be theorized, it will become clear that different landscape definitions are a result of different theoretical and cultural perspectives.

Defining “Landscape”

A scholar’s definition of “landscape” relies primarily on the individual’s theoretical and methodological background and, therefore, the term is rarely defined the same way amongst different theoretical paradigms (Fairclough 1996; Johnson 2007). While these definitions focus primarily on what landscapes are, they also dictate what landscapes are not. Theoretically

determining these landscape characteristics is essential to the development of comprehensive research designs for studying and managing landscapes. However, navigating the multiple definitions of “landscape” that exist in the academic world can be frustrating for those who wish to create a unified study of landscapes.

The theoretical definition of “landscape” provided by one theoretical paradigm is often in direct conflict with concepts from another paradigm. Some of these conflicting concepts will now be discussed in this section to demonstrate the many ways in which landscapes have been defined. One of these conflicting definition characteristics is the distinction between “natural” and “cultural” landscapes. “Natural” landscapes have been defined by Bradley (2000) as those that have not been significantly developed or modified by humans and/or even those areas that have fallen out of constant cultural use. Similarly, Hood (1996) also distinguishes “planned” landscapes, including community gardens, city layouts, and parks, from all other “natural” landscapes.

Through this perspective, natural landscapes are often described as synonymous with the physical environment or the “wilderness” composed of soils, plants, and animals (Johnson 2007). These areas are free from human impact and modification; however, Bradley (2000) believes that the cultural importance of these landscapes is still worth exploring by archaeologists. While these areas may not contain historical structures or pre-European contact sites, these landscapes may still be imbued with cultural significance. In fact, the lack of physical modifications to a landscape may represent a deep cultural respect for the natural features located there.

The phrase “cultural landscape” is commonly used throughout studies conducted in both the cultural and natural sciences. At a global level, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Culture Organization (UNESCO) is concerned with the protection of landscapes considered

significant for both cultural and environmental resources. Instead of distinguishing between natural and cultural landscapes, UNESCO distinguishes between “cultural landscapes” and the “natural environment.” “Cultural landscapes” have been defined as:

...illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal and as a diversity of manifestations of the interaction between humankind and its natural environment (UNESCO 1996 as cited in Brown et al. 2005:9).

In other words, cultural landscapes are the result of human-land interactions; subsequently the natural environment includes those areas devoid of human influence. UNESCO and the World Heritage Convention of 1972 further refined the definition of “cultural landscape” by creating three subcategories to accommodate the varying levels of human-land interactions. The most clearly identified subcategory is similar to Hood’s (1996) “planned” landscape that includes landscapes intentionally created by man. The second category is the “organically evolved landscape” which is a landscape that has been profoundly impacted by human interaction but in unintentional ways. The final category is the “associative cultural landscape” which is a designation reserved for those areas that maintain significant cultural or religious importance based on its natural characteristics, as opposed to man-made characteristics (UNESCO 2011).

Not all scholars agree that a distinction between “natural” and “cultural” landscapes exist. Thomas (1993) believes that this type of distinction is actually based on preconceived Western ideas of landscape ownership and development. Instead, Thomas emphasizes that applying the term “landscape” to a physical area automatically implies cultural significance. The phrase “cultural landscape” is, therefore, seen as an unnecessary redundancy. However, the theory that

all landscapes are cultural resources is further complicated by attempts to define the characteristics of these resources.

The next theoretical debate that will be discussed here is whether landscapes exist on a physical plane, a cognitive plane, or both. The physical plane is the more conventional view as discussed by Darvill (1999:105):

Traditionally, archaeologists have viewed the landscape as a physical phenomenon that is essentially of human construction: an object or artifact that can be measured, quantified and understood in functionalist or positivist terms just like a ceramic vessel or flint axe.

The physical landscape, therefore, can be seen as the assemblage of archaeological sites and features that are related spatially, culturally, and/or temporally. Landscapes not only include those features considered historic, but also contemporary features, such as roads, parks, fences, and housing areas (Lambrick 1992).

On the other side of the spectrum, some scholars, such as Darvill (1996; 1999), define landscapes as mental constructs rather than physical locations:

The landscape does not physically exist, although some aspects of it have visible physical expression. Rather landscape is a time dependent, spatially referenced, socially constituted template or perspective of the world that is held in common by individuals and groups and which is applied in a variety of ways to the domain in which they find themselves (Darvill 1999:109).

This theoretical perspective focuses on the personal experiences, cultural perceptions, and societal values that define the characteristics of a landscape. This approach also emphasizes the ability of individual cultures to perceive unique landscapes that reflect their cultural beliefs and worldviews. Furthermore, these landscape perceptions dictate the ways in which cultures arrange and use their material culture in physical spaces. By studying the cultural and spatial

characteristics of these landscapes, archaeologists can gain insight into the less tangible aspects of cultural identity (Darvill 1996; Johnson 2007).

While some scholars define landscapes in extremes, others allow landscapes to be both physical and cognitive. According to Muir (1999), there are actually two landscapes that are experienced simultaneously by any given observer, the “real” landscape and the “perceived” landscape. The “real” landscape consists of the rocks, soil, plants, animals, water, and other tangible resources located in the area. This landscape also has an objective past and present state, recorded in the physical attributes of the landscape. The “perceived” landscape is composed of the feelings and thoughts provoked by the observer’s senses, experiences, and memories relating to the real landscape. “It is, therefore, a selective impression of what the real landscape is like. The impression may be very close to reality, or it might contain some important misconceptions” (Muir 1999:115).

One final definition debate that will be addressed in this section is the difficulty scholars encounter when defining landscape boundaries. For the most part, the scale of the landscape to be studied is dictated by the goals of the research project. For example, some scholars may define physical boundaries based on abstract lines of cultural territories or traditional lands in order to answer questions relating to identity and migration (Patterson 2008). However, other researchers may define boundaries based on physical evidence of human settlement to address questions of cultural development. Site viewsheds and an observer’s personal range of sight have also been used to define landscape boundaries (Chapman 2006; Muir 1999).

These are just a few of the conflicting theoretical points that exist between different landscape definitions. In spite of this seemingly endless array of definitions, many scholars do agree that the study of landscapes, however defined, is a worthwhile venture that can reveal

important information about their associated cultures. Furthermore, the idea that landscapes are the result of land-human interactions has been identified as the most common theme among “landscape” definitions (Carman 1996; Dower 1997; Fairclough 1996; Lambrick 1992; Muir 1996). The following section will outline the development of landscape studies in archaeology through time. Not surprisingly, the methods and goals of these studies vary as widely as the range of landscape definitions.

The Archaeology of Landscapes

Landscape studies have become increasingly popular throughout the last half century. Carman (1996) concluded that the advent of landscape-scale projects was part of archaeology’s natural progression that has expanded the scope of the discipline from studying individual artifacts, to entire sites, and now landscapes. Similarly, the theoretical and methodological approaches of these studies have further co-evolved with associated archaeological paradigms. This progression of landscape research over the last 50 years will be discussed here to further explore how landscapes are theorized and studied.

Before archaeologists began including landscapes in their research, the cultural implications of landscapes was studied primarily by cultural geographers. Carl Sauer, the founder of cultural geography, was an American geographer who studied the influence of cultures on the formation of the physical environment. In the 1930s, cultural geography established the initial academic definition of “cultural landscapes” as those natural areas with evidence of cultural impact. These landscapes were studied both temporally and spatially to understand how cultures change their environments over time (Muir 1999).

American archeology began to incorporate elements of landscape studies in earnest with the development of the processual movement of the 1950s and 1960s. Like cultural geographers

before them, processual archaeologists sought to understand cultural effects on the natural environment. Processualists continued to take these ideas a step further by investigating how the natural environment can influence cultural practices. Ideas of environmental determinism became popular during this period and continue to have their place in contemporary studies. More importantly, the incorporation of landscape studies in archaeology expanded the scope of the discipline to include multi-site and regional studies (Ashmore 2004; David and Thomas 2008; Jameson 2008; Kelly and Norman 2007; Richards 2008; Trigger 1996).

Wiley's (1953) Virú Valley project is considered to be the official beginning of settlement archaeology practices that incorporated this new landscape scale. In his study, Wiley surveyed large tracts of land that included several different communities to outline the settlement patterns of the areas both temporally and spatially. While some archaeologists of the same time, such as Steward, proposed that the settlement patterns were primarily dependent on environmental conditions, Wiley concluded that social and cultural factors are also important influences to recognize when studying settlements. Furthermore, he also demonstrated the benefits of large scale projects in archaeology to provide complete spatial context, as opposed to analyzing artifacts with minimal references to their place of origin (Trigger 1996).

Settlement ecology approaches also became a popular way to study landscapes during the processual period. These approaches combine settlement pattern studies, land use models, and regional-scale approaches with spatial analysis tools, such as geographical information systems (GIS), to explore economic, political, and ecological archaeological questions (Clark and Scheiber 2008; Trigger 1996). The theory associated with settlement ecology acknowledges that landscapes are the products of human and land interaction but also emphasizes the role of environmental resources in the cultural decision-making process. Researchers under this

approach often attempt to reconstruct past landscapes to discover those natural features that may have influenced the settlement decisions of past cultures (Anschuetz et al. 2001; Clark and Scheiber 2008; Patterson 2008; Trigger 1996).

The study of landscapes in and of themselves became more formalized as the postprocessual movement came into the archaeological discipline in the late 1970s. This new approach to landscape research went beyond studying the spatial distribution of material culture to further speculate on the cultural meanings of these landscapes. Associated research topics stepped away from environmental determinism and focused instead on the evidence of cultural identities, cosmologies, and values to be found within landscapes. Definitions of “landscape” in this new paradigm also began to include cultural perceptions, as opposed to relying solely on physical characteristics (Ashmore 2004; Clark and Scheiber 2008; David and Thomas 2008; Gilmore 2008).

While landscape archaeology is now largely considered part of the postprocessual theoretical paradigm, some archaeological researchers integrate concepts from both paradigms to answer questions about landscapes (Trigger 1996). An example of this theoretical integration is the study of ritual landscapes that include a mixed assemblage of cultural and natural features. In these studies, the researcher may include processual information relating to the spatial relationships of these features while also including information about reflected worldviews. These types of landscape studies often acknowledge the cultural importance of natural features that may or may not be reflected in material culture (Anschuetz et al. 2001; Clark and Scheiber 2008; Gilmore 2008; Patterson 2008).

Gilmore’s (2008) study of Archaic and Early Ceramic burial mounds in Eastern Colorado found that culturally constructed landscapes are subject to changes in social frameworks and that

these changes can be identified by analyzing variation in spatial patterns and site usage through time. Several factors may be responsible for the vicissitudes in landscape patterns including changes in technology, economy, and changing social networks. Gilmore (2008:99) found that, “profound changes in the rituals surrounding death and an extension of social ties beyond the local area, possibly reflecting identity based on a larger social entity” influenced a fundamental change in the socially constructed concept of landscape.

Ethnic landscape studies attempt to define and identify cultural or ethnic boundaries within certain areas. The information gathered through this research provides an increased understanding of cultural concepts of community identity and territoriality. Hood (1996) and Muir (1999) have both studied American colonial and frontier landscapes with regards to their departure from traditional British landscapes. The adjustments the pilgrims ultimately made to their landscape structure and use practices were determined to be a response not only to the differences in the natural environment, but also the internal cultural changes that were occurring as British settlers became Americans.

This discussion of archaeological landscape research is by no means exhaustive but it does provide an overview of the development and range of landscape studies within the discipline. Landscapes can be studied from many different angles and the definitions provided for the term “landscape” can be altered to accommodate the goals of various projects. Some scholars, however, are frustrated with the lack of continuity within archaeology regarding landscape studies. These frustrations along with the proposed solution of a landscape paradigm will be discussed in the following section.

Developing a Landscape Paradigm

Despite interest beginning in the 1980s to create a landscape paradigm within archaeology, a definitive landscape theory has been difficult to establish. While some scholars feel that a unifying paradigm would legitimize the methods and goals of landscape studies, others recognize the utility of a weakly defined theoretical and methodological framework towards landscapes. These researchers believe that the very strength of the landscape idea is in its ability to be flexible and accommodating to a variety of different situations and cultures (Ashmore 2004). Both sides of the argument are presented here along with a summary of the most recently proposed principles of a landscape paradigm.

Hicks and McAtackney (2007) do not support a landscape paradigm within archaeology; instead, they support the unstructured framework of landscape studies that has dominated the field. Landscapes are generally understood as the manifestation of cultural interactions with the natural world in either a real or perceived reality. Due to the unique characteristics of landscapes, it is difficult for these authors to see how the study of these resources would benefit from predetermined definitions and protocol. Furthermore, Hicks and McAtackney support a multi-disciplinary approach that includes cultural communities in the definition and study of landscapes, both past and present, as an important alternative to scholarly definitions of landscapes.

Nevertheless, other scholars, such as Anschuetz et al. (2001), have diligently attempted to create a theoretical landscape paradigm to further promote contemporary landscape studies. Supporters believe that with the adoption of this framework, archaeologists will have the ability to explore several different aspects of lived experience including concepts of identity, cultural awareness, and spirituality that extend beyond the material aspects of the archaeological record.

The most recently proposed framework is based on the commonly accepted landscape principles which have been supported by a variety of scholars. These principles include (Anschuetz et al. 2001; Philips 2005):

1. Landscapes are not synonymous with the natural environment but should be considered culturally created products that have been imbued with meaning;
2. Landscapes are holistic including both physical and perceived characteristics;
3. Landscapes are universal and serve as the grounds for all communal identity wherever people and nature interact;
4. Landscapes are constantly changing as part of cultural and natural processes.

Together, these principles provide a theoretical base for archaeological investigations of landscapes. Each of these principles will be further examined below and supplemented with additional viewpoints from various scholars.

Principle 1: Landscapes as Cultural Products

Earlier sections of this chapter have shown the diversity of landscape definitions and approaches within the archaeological discipline. In order for these principles to be generally accepted among archaeologists with multiple views, these points must remain general and broadly open ended. This first principle reflects the most common theme that landscapes are the result of human/cultural interaction with the natural environment and that the resulting products are culturally significant (Ashmore 2004; Bender 1993b; Fairclough 2008b; Layton and Ucko 1999). However, this principle does not dictate whether landscapes are physical or cognitive realities, or both.

While determining the characteristics of these culturally created landscapes is left up to individual scholars, this principle indicates that apart from the physical features and structures that may be present on a landscape, cultural perceptions and beliefs are a part of these landscapes. Hood (1996) expresses this principle well by claiming that landscapes are the

physical embodiment of culture in a given space representing the structure, context, and history of that culture. Chapman (2006:130) also states that “landscapes consist of a series of places that are culturally constructed to the activities, stories, or memories associated with them.”

Several authors have commented that every landscape is a unique cultural construction and that while the significance of these areas appears to be obvious to individuals in a society, it is not inherent. Instead, the significance of landscapes is bestowed and ascribed by cultures (Basso 1996; Fairclough 2008b; Low 2008). Furthermore, the importance of these areas is continually reinforced through cultural memories, values, and beliefs. In Western societies, researchers themselves play a part in bestowing significance as they select landscapes to study. Muir (1999:182) states:

Each landscape has its own particular character and qualities and viewers will tend to evaluate landscapes according to their perceived merits, which will include aesthetic and ecological considerations as well as others, like cultural characteristics.

One final aspect that is important to discuss here is the possibility of multiple landscapes occupying the same space simultaneously. This concept is not accepted by all scholars but it is supported by this principle and additional scholarly research. For example, Kelly and Norman (2007:173) have stated that:

We see the landscape approach as considering the contested and imagined locales that are in a constant state of cultural construction, deconstruction and reconstruction. Central to this perspective is the notion that there is not one single landscape, but rather that landscape varies through time and, importantly, as it is created through the interaction of human actors in space, that landscape can and does vary in the experience of different groups or individuals.

Many scholars have established that different cultures perceive and use their surroundings differently, effectively creating and experiencing different landscapes (Anschuetz 2007; Bender 1993b; Fairclough 2008b; Hood 1996; Marcucci 2000; Morphy 1993; Philips

2005). Therefore, it can be proposed that even when multiple cultures utilize the same area, they are each experiencing a different culturally constructed landscape simultaneously. However, the majority of scholars continue to focus on a singular landscape on which multiple cultures interact with nature and each other. The approach advocated here allows for both perspectives but the importance of cultural landscape perceptions and the possibility of multiple landscapes are emphasized.

Principle 2: Holistic Landscapes

Viewing the landscape as a space that incorporates more than the archaeologically-defined physical environment is a distinct departure from traditional archaeological theories and methods. Approaching landscapes from a holistic point of view incorporates different aspects of the human lived experience that may have been overlooked in the past, especially cultural ideologies and intangible heritage (Fairclough 2008a). Intangible heritage represents mediums, such as oral traditions, dances, rituals, and cultural knowledge, which further embody the cultural importance of landscapes. Cultural spaces continue to be an integral part of everyday life and cultural identity, important qualities to consider when conducting landscape research (Basso 1996; Blake 2009)

Landscapes can be seen as “meeting grounds” not only between different cultures but also between nature and culture, the past and the present, as well as tangible and intangible resources. The interaction of these elements creates a sense of place and identity for communities while also creating a record of past and present culture history (Fairclough 2008b; Phillips 2005). While archaeologists often focus on physical/historical features, “the impact of landscape is felt through all the senses: it is heard, smelt and felt too” (Phillips 2005:19). When

considering the cultural significance of landscapes, these experiences should be seen as equally important.

Landscapes cannot be defined or treated the same as historical objects and isolated archaeological sites. Unlike artifacts and, to extent monuments and structures, landscapes cannot be removed from their contexts and placed in museums. Instead, landscapes remain interconnected to surrounding areas both physically and cognitively (Fairclough 1996; Muir 1999). When studying landscapes, the holistic environment, along with cultural perceptions and daily cultural interactions, must be included. Many researchers have accounted for these holistic landscape features by incorporating interdisciplinary models into their research (Carman 1996; Muir 1999).

Capturing the essence a holistic landscape requires more than the physical description of cultural features; rather, it requires a comprehensive look at how these elements interact and impact each other as a collective assemblage (Marcucci 2000). These elements are part of the complex context of cultural interaction with the landscape, both past and present, which is considered essential to the understanding of landscape conflicts (Bender 1993a). A holistic landscape incorporates all of these values and more as fundamental factors to the creation and use of cultural landscapes. Darvill (2002) has argued that including these holistic concepts at a scale that better reflects the way humanity actually functions may be landscape archaeology's greatest contribution.

Principle 3: Landscape as a Universal Concept

This third principle taken from Anschuetz's et al. (2001) framework indicates that all communities create and give meaning to landscapes based on their cultural beliefs. The way in which these landscapes are defined is based on the cultural perceptions and worldviews of the

associated cultures. This includes aspects beyond experiencing the physical properties of the landscape to include the holistic characteristics covered by the second principle (Anschuetz 2007). An important distinction to be made about this principle is that while all cultures create landscapes, these landscapes may be radically different from one another and potentially unrecognizable between cultures (Marcucci 2000).

The importance of this principle is the acknowledgement that these landscapes, regardless of definition, are an integral part of a culture's identity. Basso (1996:109) believes that landscapes are part of cultural identities because "relationships to places are lived most often in the company of other people." Furthermore, the physical, everyday connection and interaction with landscapes reinforce cultural worldviews and identities (Johnson 2007). More recently, landscape studies have begun to incorporate place name studies into their research as a way to understand the intimate connections between cultures and their landscapes (Basso 1996; Johnson 2007).

However, this universal concept of landscapes does not allow for the generalization of landscape perceptions or definitions between different cultures. Thomas (1993) advises researchers to be weary of their predisposed perceptions of landscapes, especially when studying non-Western cultures. Western ideas of landscapes are not "applied in the same way by all people at all times, and thus cannot represent a definitive way of apprehending the world" (Thomas 1993:20). This indicates the need to interpret the first and second principles of this framework along with the importance of community involvement when conducting landscape studies.

Principle 4: Landscapes are Constantly Changing

The final principle of this landscape paradigm addresses the ability of landscapes to change through time and space. Lazzari (2008:648) states:

...landscapes are neither homogeneous nor static. Not only may multiple spatialities coexist in any given landscape but landscapes are also always infused by movement. Moving bodies (for example, people, objects, animals, and so on) perpetually shaped the boundaries of landscapes and their conceptualizations. Like 'culture,' landscapes may be better viewed as a hybrid space of belonging with very porous boundaries.

While the evidence for physical impacts to landscapes can be more obvious, landscapes also are affected by changing cultural perceptions and beliefs (Fairclough 2008b; Philips 2005).

Landscape perceptions are constantly evolving as communities continue to have new experiences with the natural environment and other cultures. Sometimes these changes reflect or cause cultural upheaval; other times these changes occur without a conscious awareness (Basso 1996; Bender 1993b). Reasons for change can stem from any number of factors including changes within cultural systems, nature, and/or the eruption of conflict among peoples.

Marcucci (2000) identifies several factors, both natural and cultural, that can create physical change on the landscape. He notes five general categories of long-term change processes or "keystone processes:" 1) geomorphological processes, 2) climate change, 3) colonization patterns and growth of organisms, 4) local disturbances of individual ecosystems, and 5) cultural processes. Cultural processes include evolving agricultural and industrial practices along with changes to and expansions of settlement patterns. Marcucci stresses the ability of natural forces to change cultural interactions with their landscapes and, therefore, their landscape perceptions. However, he also mentions the ability of cultures to impact the natural environment for the same purposes. After all, cultures and the natural environment are

constantly influencing the development of one another (Feinman 1999; Hood 1996; Marcucci 2000).

Although the rate of change varies, cultures and the natural environment constantly change and evolve. When studying landscapes, it is important to understand both the cultural and physical processes that continue to shape the landscape in the past, present and future. “Each landscape is the unique product of the complex and singular interactions between its various distinctive components” (Muir 1999:49). Understanding the changing physical characteristics and cultural perceptions of landscapes is important for investigating conflicts like those that will be presented in the following chapter.

Chapter Summary

At the most basic level, landscapes can be defined as the product of cultural interaction with the natural environment. However, additional attempts to define landscapes for archaeological or anthropological research are highly contentious within the discipline. Ultimately, these definitions are based on the theoretical backgrounds of the researcher; similarly, cultural definitions of landscapes are based on the cultural perceptions and worldviews of the community. Understanding this concept leads many to believe that there cannot be a singular definition of “landscape.” Instead, the defining characteristics and boundaries of landscapes are subjective to the cultural and environmental situations of each individual research project.

Landscapes have been studied through a variety of methods and theoretical lenses reflecting the changing theoretical trends of archaeology. Anschuetz’s et al. (2001) framework for a landscape paradigm is useful for identifying those landscape principles that are most generally accepted among the archaeological community. However, it continues to allow for

flexibility in determining the specific characteristics of each landscape. These principles focus on the dynamic, social context of landscapes, manifested not only through human constructions but also cultural perceptions. The paradigm also acknowledges the benefits of incorporating an interdisciplinary approach, which may also draw on multiple theoretical backgrounds.

While these ideas of landscape are well established in archaeological literature, these principles generally have not been translated into the practical realm of cultural resource management. The broad umbrella of this paradigm would be especially useful in CRM where multiple cultures are in conflict over the use of the same geographical area. Landscape conflicts often erupt between cultures not only because of their strong connections to cultural identities, but also because these areas often contain a wide variety of both cultural and environmental resources (Bender 1993b). Understanding the reasons for these conflicts can assist in the management of landscapes in national parks and other areas where the interests of stakeholders clash.

The governmentality thesis is another body of literature that may lend additional understanding to the difficulties of managing landscape conflicts, particularly where the National Park Service or other government agencies are involved. This theory states that:

The mobilization of archaeological knowledge within institutions of the state through CRM may be understood as not simply technical responses to the physical needs of conservation of material culture, but as part of the processes of identifying, classifying and ‘governing’ populations who are, in part, identified by their links to material culture (Smith 2004: 72).

Laurajane Smith (2004) highlights the role anthropology and archaeology have played as a “technology of government” to create governing policies over cultural sites and artifacts. This is often translated as a type of political control that may manifest itself in the form of CRM

legislation, Federal ownership over cultural materials, and/or the emphasis of expert knowledge in court cases.

According to the governmentality model, the opinions of Western experts and officials are considered paramount in defining, studying, and determining ideas of cultural heritage, identity, and histories. Furthermore, this discourse tends to reject the possibility of multiple interpretations of the past and the credibility of cultural knowledge, particularly oral traditions. This is especially problematic when paired with the revelation that different cultures hold different worldviews and landscape perceptions. The political implications of governmentality within CRM law and policy will become evident in the legislative discussions of Chapters 5 and 6. The inability of many CRM agencies to consider multiple landscape perceptions is directly connected to the inadequate management of these resources.

Management issues relating to national park landscapes have become more prominent within the last few decades. In general, these issues are related to conflicting interests from different cultural groups regarding how these areas are to be used and maintained. This thesis will use the theoretical concepts discussed in this chapter to analyze and critique common approaches to the management of landscapes. The ideas that landscapes are defined by cultural perceptions and the possibility of multiple landscapes occupying the same space will be the primary theoretical concepts used to argue the inadequacies of these methods.

Chapter 3: Issues in Landscape Management

The National Park Service (NPS) is currently responsible for nearly 400 units of land under the categories of national monuments, national parks, battlefields, and historic landmarks among others. All of these NPS administered areas experience a varying degree of management issues regarding natural and cultural resources. While the causes of these issues also vary, this thesis focuses on those issues related to the management of national park landscapes as cultural resources. This chapter will outline some of the major issues concerning these landscapes, primarily cases where these issues are the result of conflicting expectations in land use practices and perceptions of landscapes.

This chapter includes a summary of the Prayer and Fasting Site Project of 2010 from Glacier National Park. The startling results suggest that current management plans employed within the park are not adequately protecting these significant cultural resources. How then should the NPS approach the management of these cultural landscapes? This chapter will attempt to answer this question and demonstrate the need to better incorporate the theoretical concepts discussed in Chapter 2 in the management of landscapes.

Difficulties with Landscapes

While landscapes and their cultural features are subject to many threats to their physical and cultural integrity, impacts from national park visitors may be some of the most destructive. Some scholars express this phenomenon as “loving a park to death” (Eagles and McCool 2002; Vander Stoep and Roggenbuck 1996). The most common symptoms of this destructive behavior are overcrowding and over usage of resources. Many of the impacts that occur during this over-loving are unintentional and often unbeknownst to the perpetrators.

Vander Stoep and Roggenbuck (1996:88) have outlined the varying ways in which people can impact resources:

1. Inadvertent or unintentional damage to the resources (result of too many people using a given resource, over too short a time to allow recovery or regeneration, which can cause damage to soils, vegetation, wildlife, cultural resources, physical structures, etc.);
2. Careless use of resources resulting in damage (e.g. litter, cigarette butts or unattended camp or cooking fires which could cause uncontrolled fires; pounding nails in trees to hang lanterns);
3. Stress on infrastructure, often by outstripping capacity for which a system or structure was originally designed (water supply and waste treatment systems; roads, bridges, buildings and visitor centers; electrical systems, etc.);
4. Technological advances and changes in user equipment which often do not match original site design or intended uses (e.g. RVs which require larger, straighter roads with less grade; stronger bridges; wider turning radiuses);
5. Intentional behaviors, often not perceived as damaging behaviors by those engaged but which do damage resources (e.g. carving on trees, bridges, railings; feeding wildlife; shortcutting of trails; wandering off designated trails to reach spectacular views or interesting objects).

Ideally, a resource manager would identify the types of impacts affecting cultural resources and build a management plan to counter the destruction based on this information. However, finding a management solution for impacts to landscapes may not be so easy. As Chapter 2 demonstrated, the definable characteristics of landscapes are hardly agreed upon by scholars, let alone cultures. What one culture may define as an adverse effect on a landscape may be seen as a positive effect to another. Furthermore, establishing a perimeter around an area to be managed can also be difficult if stakeholders cannot agree on the boundaries of an area. Entire countries, continents, and even the world could be considered one large landscape (Dower 1997).

Conflict in park management often occurs when different parties or cultures have different ideas about how parks should be maintained and managed. Eagles and McCool (2002:141) state that:

The social science foundations for the presence of conflict among visitors or between visitors and agencies are many. They include differing values, beliefs and worldviews, motivations and expectations for specific recreational engagements, lifestyle differences and individual characteristics (e.g. ethnicity).

As national parks grow and mature, conflicts between stakeholders increase as new interest groups become involved. The arrival of concessioners into parks can be especially problematic with their tendency to change national park landscapes. Therefore, a decision-making process that adequately involves and considers all stakeholders is essential. “The success of park management is often measured by the balance between individual and group interests in park tourism” (Eagles and McCool 2002:37).

These elements of public impact and the degrees of resulting conflict are important for understanding how to best manage national park landscapes. However, each individual situation is unique and subject to its own defining characteristics. While this thesis continues to discuss these issues in generalities, the remainder of this chapter provides an example of a landscape conflict that still requires resolution. The problem presented here will serve as the primary issue to be addressed throughout the rest of this paper.

Glacier National Park Background and Stated Objectives

Glacier National Park was founded on May 11, 1910 with the purpose of preserving “the outstanding mountain area” including a variety of natural wonders, such as glaciers, plant and animal communities, and the unique topography. Along with these natural resources, many cultural resources-historic and precontact archaeological sites, structures, and Native American sacred sites, and others-are to be preserved and protected within the park’s 15,383 square miles (Glacier National Park 1977:1; Reeves 2003). As with most National Park areas, there is a dual

purpose to not only protect these resources for the future but to also allow the public to enjoy them (O'Brien 1999).

Glacier is not only a national park site but also a World Heritage Site, a Biosphere Reserve, and part of the world's first international peace park. Contributing factors to these designations are the park's mountain scenery, 40 glaciers, and a variety of cultural resources which provide enjoyment for over 2 million visitors each year. Individual cultural resources in the park have been placed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and designated as National Historic Landmarks. These esteemed designations add additional cultural resource management stipulations and expectations intended to further protect these resources (Glacier National Park 1999:1).

The cultural resource management objective of Glacier National Park is "to identify, evaluate, protect, and preserve the park's archaeological, historical, and architectural resources in a manner consistent with legislative and executive requirements, National Park Service Policies, and the perpetuation of the park's natural resources" (Glacier National Park 1977:13). However, the park must also make the resources of the park available for the enjoyment of the public, which can inevitably put these resources at risk. The recreational objective of the park is "to make available diverse opportunities for public recreational activities, such as picnicking, camping, riding, hiking, boating, and sightseeing in locations and at intensity levels that are compatible with long-term perpetuation of natural and cultural resources" (Glacier National Park 1977:13).

When it comes to the management of historic park facilities, Glacier's management philosophy is to maintain the "western national park character" that is an integral part of the park's identity. The management strategy Glacier implements focuses on maintaining this

historic identity and preserving resources; simultaneously adapting the plan to address visitor concerns (Glacier National Park 1999:24). The management of Native American resources relies heavily on consultation with affiliated tribes. These tribes often are active in creating interpretive and educational programs that relate to the Native American sites in the park and also Native culture both past and present in that area (Johnson 2009).

Identification of Conflict and Stakeholders

Glacier National Park management personnel have long been aware of the conflicts that can result from the conflicting goals between the promotion of public recreation and the protection of cultural properties. In recent decades, previously recorded prayer and fasting sites have been identified as resources particularly threatened by public recreation. Scholars Brian Reeves (1994) and John Dormaar (2002) have been the forerunners in researching these areas and calling attention to the fact that they are rapidly succumbing to the impacts of recreational activities. Documented impacts include graffiti, litter, site deconstruction and reconstruction, and noise pollution (Reeves 1994).

In previous surveys, over 100 potential prayer and fasting sites have been recorded in the combined Waterton-Glacier National Park in a variety of locations (Johnson 2009; Reeves and Peacock 2001). These are referred to only as “potential” or “previously recorded prayer and fasting sites” because many of them were identified and recorded without consultation with Native American tribes. While there is a possibility that these sites are not prayer sites, the management staff at the park continues to consider them as cultural resources to be preserved in accordance with their management policies.

Prayer and Fasting Site Project 2010

Several archaeological and historic preservation projects have been carried out within the park throughout the decades. However, Dr. Brian Reeves and Dr. John Dormaar are the only two individuals prior to this project who have extensively dealt with prayer and fasting sites within the Glacier area. Dormaar recorded several features that he claimed “potentially could have been used as prayer and fasting sites” and took numerous photographs that are now on file at Glacier National Park (Dormaar 1988; Dormaar 2002; Dormaar and Reeves 1993). These features were not recorded during an official project, and it is unknown exactly when these surveys were completed, but the site forms have since been incorporated into the archaeological database. Reeves has also recorded a number of “prayer and fasting sites” and notes in several published works that many of these areas had been impacted by the visiting public (Reeves 1994; Reeves 2003; Reeves and Peacock 2001).

The objective of the Prayer and Fasting Site Project was to assess the level of impact public access and natural processes have had on selected prayer and fasting sites in Glacier National Park. The information gathered was designed to update site forms and create a readable report relaying the site condition assessment data. This report was made available to park personnel at the discretion of Glacier’s Cultural Resource Specialist, Lon Johnson, and tribal representatives for the purpose of sparking future CRM planning focused on the preservation of these cultural areas. The basic methods and conclusions of this project will be discussed here, but out of respect for tribal wishes, all sensitive information, including the location and specific uses of sites, is excluded.

Field Methods

The fieldwork for this project took place over a period of three weeks, July 11 to August 1, 2010, during which eight previously recorded prayer and fasting sites were surveyed and subject to condition assessments. Six of the eight sites were surveyed by Emily Eide (2010) and Scott Pritchard, both from the University of Montana; the two other sites were surveyed with the additional help of Glacier Seasonal Archaeologists John Kinsner and Alexander New. The sites surveyed during this project were chosen based on past documentation of prayer and fasting sites provided by Dormaar and Reeves. In all, fourteen sites were recommended for survey and condition assessments; however, due to unfavorable weather conditions and time constraints, only eight sites were actually surveyed.

Emily Eide acted as the principle investigator for this project and worked closely with Lon Johnson to obtain a research permit from Glacier National Park that allowed for the completion of these surveys. Before the permit was finalized, a copy of the project proposal was reviewed by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai and Blackfeet Tribes. Meetings were held with the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribal Historic Preservation Department to address concerns regarding appropriate research methodologies, site confidentiality, and the expected conduct of the researchers.

While the majority of these sites were surveyed during day trips, a few of the sites required multiple days to access. In accordance with land-use regulations, backcountry camping permits and Blackfeet Reservation Recreation Permits were obtained for this project. Minimal equipment was used to locate and survey these sites. For navigation and determining UTM coordinates, standard hiking maps were used along with a GARMIN GPSmap 60c device. However, after cross-checking the UTM coordinates with azimuths and grid maps, it was

determined that the GPS unit's setting was consistently inaccurate by 250ft North and 100ft West. This was likely caused by the use of a different datum point during the original recording of the features. This discrepancy remained consistent throughout the project and UTM coordinates were always cross-checked before being officially recorded.

Upon arriving at each site, the record site form of each individual site was compared directly to the current state of the site. When possible, the contexts of the record photos were used to further determine that the correct area for the site had been located. In some cases, it was possible to identify rocks in the record photos that were still present at the site. Once the team was confident that the correct area for the site was found and UTM coordinate information documented, any relevant structures were measured and photographed. When photographing a site, the team attempted to use the same camera placement as used in the record photos as noted earlier. Sketches of the site features and any other associated artifacts or graffiti were also drawn.

While at the site, notes were taken relating to the "Archaeological Site Status Evaluation" forms. These notes were then edited and transferred to the official form once the team returned from the field. Additional observations were made about any man-made structures present along the routes to these sites as well as the number of hikers seen on the trails near the surveyed site. Brief conversations with Park Rangers were also useful in determining the popularity of certain areas for recreationalists. However, project specifics were never mentioned to either Park Rangers or encountered recreationalists.

Data Analysis

The data analysis for this project was primarily concerned with determining the level of impact at each site and the causes of these impacts outlined by the National Park Service's "Archaeological Site Status Evaluation." This form evaluates the physical condition of a site and

the need for stabilization along with the types of impacts affecting the site. Impacts to a site can range from minimal, natural disturbances to complete destruction from human activities. The condition of each archaeological site is determined to be one of four levels; Good, Fair, Poor, or Destroyed. The current site condition level is based on the results of the last recorded evaluation or the original site form.

The level of impact to a site can be expressed as one of five categories including Severe, Moderate, Low, None, and Unknown. All of the sites surveyed during this project were determined to have experienced either a “Moderate” or “Low” level of impact. It is believed that all of the sites surveyed may still be able to yield important information as significant cultural resources and should continue to be protected. To receive a “Moderate” level of impact rating, the impact to the site must meet one of the following criteria:

- The resource will be significantly damaged or irretrievably lost if action is not taken within 5 years.

- The situation caused by the impact is potentially threatening to visitor or staff safety.

- The resource has been damaged and some integrity has been lost, but it still has interpretive and/or information potential; it may be a significant resource and contribution to the understanding of history or prehistory.

To receive a “Low” level of impact rating, impacts must meet one of the following criteria:

- The continuing effect of the impact is known and will not result in significant or irreparable damage to the resource.

- The impact and its effects are not a direct threat to visitor or staff safety.

- The resource has received only minor impacts which have not affected its information or interpretive potential; its integrity as an information source remains intact and it may be a significant and contribute to the understanding of history or prehistory.

Causes of impact include both human and natural factors ranging from bioturbation to deliberate site destruction. The most common categories of impact to the surveyed sites included natural weathering processes, recent graffiti, and the rearranging of site features into cairns or

windbreaks. Along with the “Archaeological Site Status Evaluation” form criteria, additional information about the documentation and the difficulty of access of the location of the site area was also gathered. This information was used to investigate the relationship between the levels of impact, the popularity of the location for recreationalists, and/or the ease of access to the area where the site is located.

Results

The research conducted during this project produced startling results. Of the eight sites that were surveyed, two (25%) were given a “Low” impact rating resulting primarily from natural forces, two (25%) were given a “Moderate” impact rating resulting from both natural and human factors, and four (50%) were given a “Moderate” impact rating resulting from human activities. In other words, up to 75% of the sites showed evidence of human impact. The most common forms of human impact were graffiti, the rearrangement of rock structures, noise pollution, and the placement of summit registers. However, additional observations of recreational behavior along trails indicates that these impacts are not site specific but can be placed under an umbrella of recreationalists’ interactions with the landscape (Eide 2010).

There is a distinct connection between the popularity of a site location and the level of impact at the site. The general trend shows that as the popularity of the site increases so does the level of impact. Summit sites in particular are most at risk. However, a solid correlation cannot be established between the ease of access and the level of impact. It may be that the easily accessible sites are more likely to be impacted, but it seems that the level of popularity is a better measure to predict “at risk” sites. Understanding these trends will help direct attention to other sites that may be at risk throughout the park.

Several other observations were made during this project that point to other signs of public impact on the landscape that encompasses these sites. While hiking one particularly popular trail, over 100 cairns of various sizes were seen lining the route to and over the pass. The cairns were placed 20 to 50 feet apart and were easily recognizable along the suggested trail route. These cairns are meant to help hikers navigate over the pass and through the snowfields that often cover the trail. Some of these cairns even had spray painted markings to direct hikers. Similar marking systems were noted along other trail routes along with other rock formations likely used as windbreaks.

Apart from rock cairns and graffiti, summit registers are additional indicators of the public's desire to leave their marks on the landscape. Initials and other messages were found at a few of the sites surveyed and at other locations around the park. The two summit registers that were recorded were homemade by the hikers and had not been installed by park personnel. These are all examples of how recreationalists interact with and experience the landscape around them. If these sites are to be protected, the public's desire to physically mark their presence on the landscape needs to be addressed.

Chapter Summary

Overall, the Prayer and Fasting Site Project has brought to light the potential adverse effects of unmonitored recreation in areas of cultural significance. Additional assessments of other sites within the park and further research into the connection between the popularity of site areas and levels of impact are needed. This report was presented to the Confederated Salish Kootenai and Tribal Historic Preservation Department in November 2010 and will also be presented to other interested parties, including Glacier National Park staff in the future. It is

hoped that this report will help create management plans that foster the continuance of cultural resource protection while maintaining recreational opportunities within the park.

The Glacier National Park case study presented in this chapter along with the discussion about the conflicts that can result from clashing landscape ideologies shows some of the management issues that are faced by many parks. The following chapters will dissect the current management policies of the NPS and show where changes can be made to further address these types of issues in a new way. Landscapes present unique management challenges and as national parks become increasingly crowded with eager visitors, changes in management policies may be needed.

Chapter 4: Approaches to Landscape Management

As landscape studies have gained academic popularity over the decades, several different approaches to understanding and studying these landscapes have also evolved. Theoretical and methodological trends relating to archaeological landscapes have also found their way into cultural resource management (CRM) practices. However, many of the standard approaches used by the National Park Service (NPS) to record and manage landscapes fail to address the full complexity of these resources. This chapter will review some of the common approaches to landscape management that have been utilized by the NPS, as well as other agencies.

Every approach addressed here has value and adds something to the management of cultural resources. However, many of these models fail to address the theoretical characteristics of landscapes discussed in Chapter 2. Understanding these areas of weakness is important when addressing the landscape concerns presented in the previous chapter. In general, this review will reveal the importance of addressing these landscapes as dynamic, culturally defined resources that may or may not have tangible aspects.

Many of the fundamental aspects to CRM practices with regards to landscapes and other resources are grounded in archaeological methods, which can be broken down into two primary categories: descriptive and interpretive. Descriptive research and management goals focus on using statistical and theoretical models that rely on a feature or site's physical characteristics. Interpretive practices, on the other hand, are concerned with the social complexities and cultural meanings of resources that may be imbedded within the feature's physical characteristics (Darvill 2002; Layton and Ucko 1999). Both of these categories have been incorporated into the management of landscapes.

The tools used by academic archaeologists and cultural resource managers for the study of landscapes have also merged. Geographic information systems (GIS) have become a popular tool for recording cultural features and their related characteristics within survey areas. The practical aspect of this computer technology is to help organize, both spatially and temporally, resource data in a singular database that can be instantly recalled. These programs can also be used to conduct predictive modeling studies based on reconstructed 3-D landscapes. Applications of this approach continue to be recognized and applied in both academic archaeology and CRM (Chapman 2006).

Although technology, such as GIS, is helpful to attain descriptive goals, further research is needed to improve interpretation of the cultural implications of these cultural features. Without fully understanding these implications, the management of these resources can be subject to misrepresentation (Lambrick 1992). This postprocessual perspective emphasizes the importance of social context and the need to understand the cultural perceptions associated with the resource in question (Shanks and Tilley 1987; Trigger 1994). Ethnographic models are often used to build an understanding of these cases, along with other methods grounded in social archaeology and anthropology. Methods associated with interpretive practices are slowly making their way into the practices of CRM.

The following discussion of landscape approaches will show that what is often missing from CRM practices is an understanding of the relationships between cultures and their landscapes. While this understanding is generally the goal of archaeological landscape studies, these relationships are often overlooked in the management process. It is within this context that the theoretical concepts of landscapes discussed in Chapter 2 can be used to further enhance the management actions of the NPS and other agencies. This change of focus can effectively move

agencies beyond descriptive methods to embrace the importance of interpretive models, which will ultimately lead to a more effective management of cultural resources.

Designation Criteria

Federal, state, and global agencies and organizations have instigated a variety of different methods for evaluating and managing cultural landscapes. Many countries, including the United States, have developed designation based systems to evaluate the significance of cultural resources and landscapes. The purpose of these evaluations is to identify exceptional cultural and/or historical resources of local, national, or global significance to be granted special protection. At a global level, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) oversees the designation and management of those natural and cultural resources deemed to be globally significant. In the United States, the criteria for listing sites on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are the standard used most commonly by CRM to evaluate cultural resources (Jameson 2008; King 2008).

The NRHP was created as part of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966. This Act mandated a process for evaluating cultural resource significance and assessing the potential for adverse effects to these resources during Federal undertakings. Generally, in order for a resource to be considered eligible for the NRHP, it must be at least 50 years old and deemed important for at least one of the following reasons (ACHP 2008):

- A. Association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local, state, or national history;
- B. Association with the lives of persons significant in local, state, or national history;
- C. Representation of distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent a work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction;

- D. Yields, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history through archaeological investigations.

The resource must also maintain integrity of setting, feeling, location, design, materials, workmanship, and association (King 2008).

If a resource is deemed eligible for the NRHP under one or more of these criteria, a certain level of protection is afforded to them. Cultural landscapes can be considered significant under these guidelines if they are associated with important historical events. The NHPA mandates that adverse effects to these eligible resources be considered and minimized or mitigated, if possible, during the planning of Federal undertakings. However, if resources, including landscapes, do not meet the NRHP criteria they are considered insignificant resources and are usually left outside the protection of most cultural resource laws, including the NHPA (King 2008).

Lawson (1997) acknowledges the inevitable destruction of cultural resources as societies continue to develop and expand. With this reality he also recognizes the necessity of designation and evaluation based systems because it is unrealistic to expect that all cultural resources can be saved. However, this system could benefit from some additional improvements. One fundamental critique of this system is that it is “expert-based.” Eagles and McCool (2002) point out that the expert-based model is no longer considered an effective management tool because it fails to adequately recognize the complex relationships that exist between cultures and their resources.

This critique is also supported by other scholars who feel that outside experts are too removed from the cultural resources they are evaluating to fully understand their community importance (Fairclough 2008b; King 2002). Furthermore, the designation criteria do not

consider the importance of resources as they relate to community identity, sense of place, or sacred importance unless it is directly associated with a specific event. Native American cultural sites and landscapes are especially neglected by this designation system because their definitions of significance do not align with those of the NRHP (Jackson and Stevens 1997). As a Federally mandated and Western expert-based system, the NRHP is an excellent example of the governmentality concept discussed at the end of Chapter 2.

One final critique of this system is its tendency to create management plans based on resource preservation, as opposed to protection. Preserving resources means identifying significant areas and maintaining these areas to look and feel a certain way; minimizing the possibility of change. Protecting a resource requires making development-controlled decisions that allow change to occur within responsible parameters. The latter approach to management is considered to be better for resources, such as landscapes, since constant change is part of their defining characteristics (Muir 1999). Furthermore, the preservation approach to landscapes has the tendency to favor one particular cultural perspective of the landscape; silencing others.

Cultural Landscape Inventories and Reports

The most basic landscape management approach at the descriptive level is the creation of inventories and reports. The main goal of this procedure is to create a record of the physical remains left behind by previous inhabitants in areas designated as “cultural landscapes.” The data collected by these projects often result in maps that can be used to understand the spatial relationships between these features. These maps are also used to identify, at a glance, those specific features that may be impacted by proposed projects, such as trail reroutes or building construction.

Preservation Brief 36 as issued by the National Park Service (NPS) defines a cultural landscape as “a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values” (Birnbaum 1994:np). The brief further breaks down cultural landscapes into four general categories that are not mutually exclusive: 1) historic site landscapes, 2) historic designed landscapes, 3) historic vernacular landscapes, and 4) ethnographic landscapes. These distinctions are used to accommodate the needs of each type of resource while maintaining generalized management plans.

Historic site landscapes are areas, such as battlefields and other landscapes, which are associated with historic events, activities, or persons. Historic designed landscapes are similar to historic site landscapes but are designed areas, such as gardens or parks, considered historic for their association with significant events or individuals. Special considerations are given to areas associated with landscape architecture, especially those areas that represent advancement in landscape architecture theory and/or practice. Historic vernacular landscapes are those areas that have been modified as a result of human activities, primarily on occupancy. These landscapes reflect the “cultural character” of those who inhabit these areas, which in turn becomes a defining characteristic of the landscape (Birnbaum 1994:np).

The last category of landscapes distinguished by the preservation brief is ethnographic landscapes, which include sacred and ceremonial landscapes. These landscapes are often a mix of natural and cultural features that are ultimately defined by experts through additional consultation with affiliated cultures from the area. The fact that these landscapes may not have any accompanying structures or designed spaces can magnify the difficulty in managing these

sites. In order to manage these types of landscapes, the NPS relies on multi-disciplinary methods and practices incorporating many different disciplines (Birnbaum 1994:np).

Preservation Brief 36 continues by outlining a plan for preserving landscapes through a series of steps. The process of evaluating and preserving landscapes is carried out through a general process that involves conducting background research, inventorying landscape conditions and attributes, evaluating the landscape's integrity, and developing a management philosophy and plan of action. These are general guidelines meant to be tailored to the needs of individual situations based on the combined interests of local residents, visitors, and professionals. The result of these landscape studies are often conveyed through cultural landscape inventories and reports that will be discussed in the following paragraphs (Birnbaum 1994).

The Cultural Landscape Inventory (CLI) is a method used by the NPS to report basic information about all historically significant features within individual landscapes as defined by agency archaeologists. The CLI records general descriptive information about landscapes along with any existing documentation and management information, including its eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. This inventory evaluates the integrity and condition of landscape characteristics, including, but not limited to, spatial organization, land use, vegetation, structures, and viewsheds. To facilitate these evaluations, large landscapes may be broken up into smaller areas of common characteristics and sorted into four different landscape types discussed above (Birnbaum 1994; Brown et al. 2001).

The first step (Level 0) of the CLI is to conduct a park reconnaissance survey to identify the scope of landscapes within a given park area, existing and needed information about the landscapes, immediate threats, and priority areas for inventory. Second (Level I), a landscape

reconnaissance survey is done to identify information about specific landscapes through site visits. An initial report of significance and character is created that is further evaluated in Level II. Also at this level, the landscape is analyzed and evaluated to define any specific landscape characteristics and associated features, both past and present, which may have historic significance as defined by the NRHP. The final step (Level III) involves a feature inventory and assessment to determine the overall significance of the landscape in its entirety (Brown et al. 2001).

The CLI system is a practical tool for CRM in that it creates a database that contributes not only to present management decisions but future ones as well. However, the information gathered is primarily concerned with the physical characteristics and documented history of the landscape features, not the cultural perceptions associated with the landscape. CLIs document the current state of landscape features and works to address issues relating to boundaries, feature documentation, and management goals; relying heavily of the criteria of the NRHP. Both CLI and NRHP approaches focus on the existence of one landscape, subject to Western definitions and perceptions, as opposed to the possibility that there may be several different landscapes being represented (Birnbaum 1994).

Similarly, a Cultural Landscape Report (CLR) is another tool used by the NPS to identify, evaluate, and record cultural landscapes. CLRs rely on historical documentation and site records in conjunction with physical observations to define and report the historical contexts of landscapes. Once again, historical significance is determined based on NRHP criteria and these resources are often reevaluated as new projects are considered that may impact these landscapes. One of the goals of these reports is to characterize the environment as it appears at

certain time periods during the year. Subsequent management plans are then considered based on the changing characteristics of each unique landscape (Birnbaum 1994).

While CLRs do include more information about the historic nature of landscapes, there remains an emphasis on the physical characteristics with little consideration for the cultural perceptions associated with these areas. Under this model, landscape integrity is measured by the “property’s historic identity evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics from the property’s historic or pre-historic period” (Birnbaum 1994:np). However, this approach does acknowledge the inevitable natural and artificial changes that impact landscapes and the necessity of including local communities in the decision process. However, it fails to accept the possibility that the involved stakeholders could simultaneously experience different landscapes occupying the same space.

The primary goal of the NPS when using these approaches is documentation as a means of management. Landscapes are recorded by any means possible, but most commonly photography, interviews, and architectural drawings. All characteristics of these historic landscapes are documented, including the spatial relationship between features and the surrounding natural elements, to the greatest detail possible. Some reports even provide seasonal analysis to accurately account for the changes that occur throughout the year. These detailed reports serve as a baseline from which levels of physical change and integrity are measured. Despite the level of detail expected in this documentation, the cultural perceptions of those connected to the area are rarely included.

Cultural resource inventories and reports are in harmony with the holistic principle of the landscape paradigm. Preservation Brief 36 states that “when developing a strategy to document a cultural landscape, it is important to attempt to read the landscape in its context of place and

time” (Birnbaum 1994:np). While this additional attention to the context of a landscape is a step towards adequate landscape documentation, this approach still does not account for changing cultural perceptions. Instead, these inventories and reports continue to focus on the physical characteristics of these landscapes and their significance as defined by Western-based systems.

Within these management approaches, a cultural landscape is seen as a physical space that encapsulates a set of historical features and their surrounding context. Multiple landscapes can exist in this model but they are defined temporally, not culturally. Essentially, the NPS acknowledges that physically different landscapes existed in the past that may have had different levels of significance but they have since been “written over” (Cosgrove 1984; Muir 1996). There exists only one landscape at any given time that incorporates the views of all associated cultures. Furthermore, the preservation of a landscape’s physical appearance is considered a primary management goal and the ideal appearance is decided by the “experts.”

In general, CLIs and CLRs fail to account for the complexities of landscapes discussed in Chapter 2. Under these management approaches, landscape change and evolution is not sufficiently accounted for, especially with regards to cultural perceptions. The preservation of a resource’s physical characteristics is often placed before other cultural aspects that may also be important, such as the renewal of an area’s sacred power. King (2002) feels that the focus on physical structures in these models may indicate an “archeo-” and/or “architectural-bias” in the management of landscapes. In addition, these guidelines provide no considerations for the inevitable changes that will occur to these landscapes both physically and culturally in the future. Perceptions of these landscapes are subject to inevitable change and, therefore, management plans must be flexible and accepting of these changes.

Interdisciplinary Methods of Management

Some approaches to landscape management have combined the management of natural and cultural resources into a singular plan as a means to provide more holistic protection. These models are based on the acknowledgement of the inseparable connection between nature and culture. “Recent experience has demonstrated that in many landscapes the natural and cultural heritage are inextricably bound together and that the conservation approach could benefit from more integration” (Mitchell and Buggey 2000:35). In addition to acknowledging the cultural importance of these natural areas, this approach also recognizes the benefits of including affiliated cultures in the management of these resources (Leal 1998; McGlade 1999; Mitchell and Buggey 2000; Phillips 2005).

An example of natural and cultural resource management teams working together to manage one landscape can be found in Norway. Tveit (2006) describes how burial mounds in parts of this country have significance to managers of both disciplines but for different reasons. While the mounds hold significant cultural value for the descendants of those buried within them, the diversity of plant-life that grows on their unique soil composition are of special interest to ecologists and biologists. However, encroaching farm practices and the “invasion” of trees and shrubs threaten the existence of these mounds. By working together to protect these resources, they have been able to protect all significant aspects of these mound group landscapes.

The inclusion of local communities associated with these protected landscapes has also been seen as an important development in these interdisciplinary management methods. Natural resource programs in particular have begun to focus on the time tested ecological and cultural practices that have been used by indigenous cultures around the world. In fact, many national parks and protected areas outside of the Western Hemisphere continue to allow the residence of

indigenous populations. In these models, traditional knowledge is considered to be like another scientific discipline with theories and practices of its own (Eagles and McCool 2002).

The importance of including traditional knowledge and landscape perceptions in management policies is supported by the theoretical concepts discussed in Chapter 2. In particular, the idea that local communities are best suited to identify and evaluate significant cultural resources is strongly supported. Fairclough (2008:299) shows the importance of this when stating, “What ‘ordinary’ people value might be different to what experts value, or they might value the same things but for quite different reasons, such as for reasons of association, memory, or locality.” The inclusion of this insider perspective is also useful for establishing good working relationships between managers and stakeholders.

In the United States, Native Americans have become more involved in CRM programs and management plans as their connections to traditional landscapes have become more understood. “In this new philosophical and political environment, archaeologists and cultural resource managers can no longer rely on material culture alone to identify or describe historic and archaeological properties” (Jameson 2008:54). Instead, interdisciplinary work between Native Americans, anthropologists, local communities, and ecologists must be undertaken to account for the full range of landscape attributes that may have otherwise been dismissed (Allison 1999; Lane 2008; Zimmerman 2005).

Ethnographic Approaches

Landscapes, as discussed in Chapter 2, are culturally defined resources that are subject to constant change. While managers tend to focus on the physical features and structures that may be present as part of a landscape, it is important to remember that landscapes exist because of their relationships with cultural groups. People are constantly renewing their connections to their

landscapes through both physical interaction and by simply thinking about these areas (Carman 1996). For this reason, it is important for relevant cultural views and perceptions to be included in the creation of management plans.

Ethnographic methods borrowed from cultural anthropology have been applied to some management approaches of landscapes. This is the most complete way in which the cultural perceptions of landscapes can be discovered and adequately addressed where other approaches fail to include this type of information (Lane 2008). Fairclough (1996) feels that although inventories of historically significant resources are beneficial, they largely oversimplify the complexities of landscapes by neglecting ethnographic information. Furthermore, it is the present-day perceptions of these resources that will potentially be the source of conflict among interest groups rather than to the perceptions of landscapes in the past.

Basso (1996) has worked as an ethnographer among the Western Apache to identify “sense of place” and landscape meaning among that culture and others. As a participant observer, Basso learned the names and stories associated with many areas on the landscape and related how their importance transcends their physical existence. Aside from subsistence resources; cultural values, beliefs, and knowledge also are connected to the landscape and are considered equally important. Basso noted that these places can serve as mnemonic devices for past histories and interaction with these places on a daily basis reaffirms the significance of these landscapes. He also emphasizes the value of actually experiencing these places, as opposed to only knowing about them through stories.

Low (2008) draws on her work with cultural use patterns in urban parks and heritage sites to emphasize the importance of managing landscapes for the local community as well as the visiting community. In light of this, Low has developed some general principles that promote

social sustainability and cultural diversity in these areas. Social sustainability refers here to “maintaining and enhancing the diverse histories, values, and relationships of contemporary populations,” including connections to landscapes (Low 2008:393). The suggested principles focus on identifying and representing the histories of all associated cultural communities and considerations of the impacts and needs of the visiting public as well by conducting ethnographic fieldwork. The primary goal is to support any and all cultural groups within or near heritage sites who ascribe cultural meaning to the areas.

Along these same lines, the NPS has created the Rapid Ethnographic Assessment Procedure (REAP) as an ethnographic tool used to achieve these sustainable goals by gathering ethnographic data to be used in determining potential project impacts and suggesting realistic alternatives. This method was originally used to investigate the connections between western Native American peoples and national park lands in an attempt to improve the communication and relationships between land managers and affected communities. REAP focuses on creating a comprehensive analysis of the contemporary interests of cultural communities along with some aspects of past importance (Low 2008).

The methodology of a REAP integrates several different mediums of information. On the physical level, maps are used that record areas of human activity based on trash and items left in given areas. Historical and archival documents are also used to add time-depth to the landscape from a historical perspective. Aside from these methods, the bulk of a REAP comes from the ethnographic data collected from interviewing associated individuals, groups, and experts. Participant observation is also an important aspect of this procedure. The results from a REAP can be used not only in mitigating project impacts but also to inspire appropriate interpretive programs (Low 2008).

This approach and other ethnographic approaches strongly support the universal principle of the landscape paradigm by acknowledging that cultures have strong connections to their landscapes. However, this method is most effective when the ethnographic information from multiple stakeholders is compared side by side. Despite the inclusion of the word “rapid” in the acronym “REAP,” this can be very time consuming and expensive, which cause some resources to remain unprotected. Furthermore, this approach does not provide guidelines for how to deal with differences found in these comparisons. Newman (1996:95) acknowledges an important point by stating that:

No matter how academically justifiable it is to claim that the landscape is not a bounded entity, or that landscapes can only be perceived personally and only have a contemporary value, such statements are of little use when faced with the need to justify variable levels of land management or to make decisions on the implications of preferred route options.

While these abstract studies of landscape may not solve conflicts in and of themselves, they do supplement other approaches which lead to decision making processes.

Landscape Histories

Landscape history based approaches can be seen as the merger of resource inventories with ethnographic models described in the previous sections. As the name suggests, these approaches focus on both the physical and cultural histories of landscapes. Ideally, a landscape history will identify how and, to some extent, why a landscape has developed over time. These histories are a compilation of archaeological evidence, historical records, present-day inventories, and ethnographic information. The theoretical perspective of this approach is based largely on the same concepts represented in the landscape paradigm in Chapter 2 (Fairclough 1999; 2008a; Marcucci 2000).

Unlike some other approaches discussed in this chapter, landscape histories are inherently open to the idea that multiple landscapes can exist simultaneously. Anschuetz's (2007) "ethnographic landscape biography" for the Valles Caldera National Preserve near Las Vegas is a prime example of the inclusion of this concept. Anschuetz begins by describing the landscape as it likely was when only Native American cultures were living in the area in the late prehistoric time period. He goes on to describe the changes that occurred as first Hispanics and then Anglo-Americans imposed new ideas of landscape ownership and land practices. Despite the presence of multiple cultural groups, each group maintained a distinct cultural landscape within Valles Caldera creating what Anschuetz (2007) refers to as a "multi-layered ethnographic landscape."

Landscape histories often define cultural landscapes as areas consisting of multiple layers stacked one on top of another. Each layer represents one culture's landscape perception manifested in physical features. Some features may originate in older layers but continue to be a part of more contemporary layers due to their continued significance; other features may be "buried" under the weight of changing perceptions (Chapman 2006). This image is especially helpful for understanding the time-depth of cultural areas and their complex pasts. This approach also allows the concept of simultaneous landscapes to become more acceptable.

However, landscape histories do not fully embrace the possibility of multiple landscapes occupying the same space. Under this approach, landscapes are physical spaces with definable boundaries, within which cultures ascribe their own significance. However, this does not constitute a completely separate landscape, only different perceptions of the same landscape (Fairclough 1996). This method defines landscapes based on a Western model at different temporal, spatial, and functional scales. This indicates an issue with this approach because not all cultures ascribe to these Western ideas of landscape. For instance, some Native American

cultures perceive their landscapes as vertical entities connecting the earth to the sky, as opposed to a horizontal piece of land (Bender 1993b; Eagles and McCool 2002).

Historical Landscape Characterization

The European Landscape Convention (ELC) has developed a landscape history method called the Historic Landscape Characterization (HLC) approach to address the historical dimensions of landscapes and to solve issues of resource conflict. While this approach was developed in England, it has also been used throughout the United Kingdom in recent years. Specifically, this method is applied to areas where multiple stakeholders are in conflict about the landscapes significance and expected usage. Understanding landscape change is central to a HLC and these conflicts are seen as part of the constant flow of change (Turner and Fairclough 2007).

In addition to the focus on landscape change, other theoretical principles instilled in the HLC process are very similar to those discussed as part of the landscape paradigm. The ELC defines a cultural landscape as “an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors” (Fairclough 2008a:413).

Furthermore, “a characterization of landscape is a matter of interpretation not record, perception not facts; ‘landscape’ is an idea not a thing, constructed by our minds and emotions from the combination and inter-relationship of physical objects” (Fairclough 2008a:413).

Fairclough (2008a:417) emphasizes the need to evaluate this inevitable process of change especially when discussing human perceptions of the landscape:

What people value in landscape, what they wish to preserve, why they wish to preserve it or manage it – all these change, all of the time. Our understanding evolves, and what we think is significant or worth keeping develops. All these changes are furthermore refracted through the autobiography, knowledge and aims of any observer. Finally, there

is future change, the ever-present potential for more change and all the decisions and valuations that precede and accompany it.

The goals of the HLC method reflect this respect for changing landscapes by emphasizing landscape protection over preservation. In accordance with the principles of the landscape paradigm, landscapes should continue to change in a sustainable, but natural, way. These areas should never be preserved as a reflection of one period of time or from the perspective of one culture. Instead, natural and cultural processes should continue to act on the landscape guided by managers to promote sustainable change and development (Fairclough 2008b).

Landscapes subject to HLCs can be read both spatially and temporally. As one looks at the landscape spatially, the significance of certain features, along with their use patterns, becomes evident. Reading the landscape temporally reveals how these features and their functions have changed over time. Using both of these dimensions is useful for understanding how major events have impacted landscape perception and use. It can also reveal which features are considered more significant than others because while they may have originated in the past, they continue to be present in the contemporary landscape (Fairclough 1999). The world today is living in the “uppermost of a stratified layering of past landscapes which survive to varying degrees” (Turner and Fairclough 2007:130).

The first step of the HLC process is the identification of cultural landscape features. All aspects of the landscape are included in this characterization including features that are considered “ordinary,” such as roads, resources that are less than 50 years old, and other features that are considered completely natural. These resources are identified with the help of archaeological survey and past records, historic documentation, and ethnographic sources. Public involvement is essential to the success of this process from the beginning. Without the

input of local communities, the HLC would likely misrepresent or even neglect important resources (Fairclough 2008a; Turner and Fairclough 2007).

After landscape features are identified and cultural information is collected, the information is stored and organized within a GIS database. From this point, researchers can create landscape layers representing different patterns between certain features in terms of functionality, temporal establishment, or other characteristics. This feature may be useful for determining which areas have the most cultural importance and which areas are most likely to be in conflict based on simultaneous use by different cultural groups (Fairclough 2008a).

While the HLC and other landscape history methods are useful for incorporating ethnographic research into the understanding of landscape features, when mechanically applied, the result can be seen as little more than a glorified landscape inventory. Furthermore, this approach has only been used in the United Kingdom where the dynamic between indigenous populations and the ruling government is different than in the United States. Federally recognized Native American tribes are given sovereign rights as domestic dependent nations, while the indigenous cultures of the United Kingdom do not have this status. As a result, the way these governments interact with these cultures when managing their cultural resources is also different. The HLC was not created with these different types of relationships in mind.

Chapter Summary

Each landscape management approach discussed in this chapter has its place in cultural resource management. However, none of these approaches are capable of adequately addressing the conflicts that can result from different landscape perceptions and expectations. While many of these approaches do incorporate some of the theoretical principles discussed in Chapter 2, none of these management tools have the ability to address multiple landscapes existing within

the same space simultaneously. In order for the conflict present in Glacier National Park to be adequately addressed, a method must be used that can address these complexities.

Landscape history approaches, specifically the HLC method, can be seen as the best suited to acknowledge the complexities of these landscapes as identified by the theoretical principles established by the suggested landscape paradigm. This approach recognizes “multiple interpretations and realities” in landscapes that result from different historical, social, and ideological contexts (Turner and Fairclough 2007). It also acknowledges that landscapes are in constant flux, that cultural perceptions are important in understanding landscape development, and that multiple landscapes can occupy the same space but that only one is active at any given time.

However, even the HLC method fails to fully acknowledge the dynamic characteristics that cultural landscapes possess. The above mentioned approaches to landscape research and management are useful for those landscapes where only one culture is concerned with its significance and future management. However, many landscapes in the Americas and the world have been used by multiple cultures, both sequentially and simultaneously. Therefore, a method is needed that is similar to the HLC approach but that also acknowledges the possibility of multiple landscapes existing simultaneously in the same space as defined by their associated cultures. Furthermore, this approach must also acknowledge that the different perceptions of these landscapes are often a source of conflict.

While such an approach does not currently exist either inside or outside of NPS management, it is the purpose of this thesis to show the necessity of this approach. It is hypothesized here that if the fundamental differences in landscape perceptions between stakeholders can be identified, solutions to landscape management issues, such as the inadvertent

destruction of Native American sacred sites in national parks, can be more adequately addressed. By understanding the underlying problem, the resulting management policies are more likely to be successful in the long-term.

An additional tool that can be further utilized in all CRM approaches is the consultation process. While consultation with all affected communities is currently mandated by Section 106 of the NHPA and other CRM legislation, many agencies do not fully engage in the activity (King 2008). Consultation with Native American communities is explicitly mentioned in many of these laws and policies and should be conducted at a government to government level. Aside from the legally mandated aspect of this process, consultation involving the different stakeholders is the only way to properly identify and understand conflicts over land management, usage, and ownership (King 2008; Lane 2008; Zimmerman 2005). Regardless of their framework, all CRM methods would benefit from increased use of consultation in their respective processes.

The following chapters serve as the beginning of an investigation into the different landscape definitions and perceptions held by the three primary stakeholders in the Glacier case study: Native American cultures, the National Park Service, and the Anglo-American visitor. Through this discussion it will become evident that when observing the area known as Glacier National Park, each of these three groups perceives a different landscape occupying that area. Therefore, it is possible to say that multiple landscapes can occupy the same space simultaneously. While the management issue presented by the Prayer and Fasting Site Project is the inspiration for this inquiry into landscape perceptions of national park lands, the views of the stakeholders involved will be discussed in broad generalities.

Chapter 5: Landscape Perceptions of Native Americans

The landscape perceptions of Native American cultures are the first of the three stakeholder groups to be discussed in this thesis. “Native American” is an umbrella term used by the United States government to represent more than 500 different cultural groups whose ancestors were present in North America before the arrival of White Europeans. In an ideal study of landscape perceptions, each culture would be individually represented as a stakeholder, each with their own unique definitions of, and relationships to, their landscapes. However, much of the information provided in this chapter is presented in generalities and is in no way meant to represent the beliefs of any cultural group in particular unless stated.

The primary reason for this general approach to the discussion of Native American landscape perceptions is out of respect for the cultures associated with these national parks. When conducting the research for the Prayer and Fasting Site Project, it was made clear that any specific cultural knowledge associated with these areas should not be made public. Therefore, cultural information about specific landscapes will not be discussed; instead, it will suffice for the purposes of this thesis to simply show that the landscape perceptions of many Native American cultures differ from those of the National Park Service and the Anglo-American tourist. The information provided below is the result of a literature review from both Native and non-Native scholars.

This chapter begins with a review of the experience many Native American cultures have had with the United States government in the pursuit to acquire lands for national parks. This is also an important aspect of the NPS landscape perception and an indicator of the resilience of the landscape values held by many Native cultures that were removed from their traditional landscapes. There will also be a discussion about the modified relationships some Native

Americans have with these landscapes now that they are national parks. The second half of this chapter will identify landscape perceptions held in general by Native Americans.

Historical Relationships with the National Park Service

Native Americans have a long culture history in the Americas spanning beyond 10,000 years according to archaeologists and into time immemorial according to many Native American cultures. Today, many Native American cultures continue to maintain traditional knowledge and connections to ancestral territories and landscapes (NPS 2007). However, for many of these cultures, their traditional homelands are now part of the national park system. Some of these areas, such as Mesa Verde National Park and Effigy Mounds National Monument in Iowa, were created specifically to preserve the cultural significance of these areas to Native American cultures. Other areas, such as Devils Tower National Monument and Glacier National Park, also contain important cultural features and landscapes associated with Native Americans but these parks were not created with these resources in mind.

Before the expansion of the Anglo-American land base and the Indian removal programs of the United States government, mountainous areas, such as Glacier National Park, were used as seasonal hunting grounds, collection sites for raw materials, and areas of spiritual practices/ceremonies (Glacier National Park 1999; Reeves 2003). Many different cultural groups occupied and used these areas simultaneously following strict cultural rules, many of which were implemented to promote the sustainable use of resources. These cultural “laws” were passed down through oral traditions from past generations and modified as situations warranted. The traditional knowledge that relayed these laws also provided the basis for landscape perceptions.

As Anglo-Americans acquired land across the continent, Native communities were displaced and often restricted to reservations at the discretion of the United States government.

Access to traditional lands was prohibited and traditional practices strongly repressed. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to discuss the entire assimilation history of Native Americans; however, the history shared between the NPS and Native American communities is critical for this discussion. When lands were acquired by the United States for the use as national parks and monuments, Native people were removed from these areas without consultation or consideration. In some cases, Native Americans were hired to work in the parks as cheap labor or to provide “authentic” entertainment for park visitors (Burnham 2000; Reeves 2003).

In the past, Native Americans associated with national park lands were seen as an undesirable element of these landscapes even while they were enlisted to perform dances and shows for tourists. They were seen as poor, backwards people who contrasted distinctly with the prestigious, wealthy tourists the parks attracted. Also, the Native American populations living within these parks hindered the attempt to market these areas as pristine wilderness untouched by human hands (Burnham 2000; Eagles and McCool 2002). “Above all, the story of national parks and Indians is, depending on your perspective, a costly triumph of the public interest or a bitter betrayal of America’s native people” (Burnham 2000:10).

National parks were considered public domain and “land in public domain belonged to the Federal government by right of discovery, purchase, conquest, or treaty” (Burnham 2000:16). These lands were rarely acquired in fully legal or ethical circumstances. Tribes were often forcibly removed, coerced into signing treaties, manipulated, cheated in land swaps and purchases, or simply left out of the land decisions made by the United States government all together. Buying the land from Native Americans was the cheapest, easiest, and best documented way for the government to acquire lands from tribes. As tribes became increasingly involved in the economy and structure of Western society, the money offered in exchange for

land by the government to ease the pains of poverty became difficult to refuse (Burnham 2000; Reeves and Peacock 2001).

Ironically, early national parks and Indian reservations held one characteristic in common: both areas were considered to be commercially “worthless” for activities, such as mining or logging. These lands were considered “worthless” because they either lacked desirable resources or the terrain made the acquisition of these resources too difficult and expensive (Burnham 2000). Even the area of Yellowstone National Park was deemed to be naturally beautiful but not economically worthwhile. These determinations were made with the economic interests of a growing America in mind. “With very few exceptions, national parks, even today, are not established if there is any economic use for the land they would occupy” (O’Brien 1999:22).

In light of these shared characteristics, reservations were often located directly next to or near national parks. However, some of these reservation areas were ultimately incorporated into nearby parks when it was discovered that these lands may not have been as “worthless” as originally thought. It became clear from early on that these areas had great economic potential through the tourism industry. The justification for acquiring these areas as national parks was now not only for the preservation of priceless resources but also for the economic potential these areas could provide through tourism (Burnham 2000; Eagles and McCool 2002). An example of this acquisition took place between Glacier National Park and the Blackfeet Reservation.

When the Little Bighorn Treaty of 1855 created the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, it originally contained the eastern side of what is now Glacier National Park. However, the Blackfeet Tribe and the United States government came to an agreement on September 26, 1895 allowing the United States to acquire “the Blackfeet Strip” as part of the eastern side of the park.

As part of the agreement, the tribe retained usufruct rights to these lands for cutting and removing timber, hunting, fishing, and religious practices as long as the area remained public land. However, when this area became Federal property in 1910 with the creation of Glacier National Park, these rights were revoked (Burnham 2000; Glacier National Park 1977; Reeves and Peacock 2001).

Interest in acquiring this strip of land was prompted by the already existing relationship between the Great Northern Railway and the Blackfeet Nation for the sake of tourism. The Federal government gave the company land through public and Native American trust lands for the completion of the railroad, which occurred in 1893. Instead of displacing all of the previous inhabitants of these areas, Great Northern enlisted the services of the Blackfeet as entertainment to entice tourists to use their services to witness these unique places of nature. The economic success of these ventures proved the economic viability of the area even before the area officially became a park (Burnham 2000).

For many decades, the rights of Native Americans for the use and access of traditional resources within national parks were adamantly denied. However, with the coming of the civil rights era also came changes to legislation and national park management that acknowledged Native American cultures' sovereign usufruct rights to these landscapes. Many treaty rights have been reinstated and today Native Americans are free to access Glacier for many cultural and spiritual purposes, although, some activities, such as hunting, are still restricted (Glacier National Park 1977; Reeves and Peacock 2001). Additionally, changing legislature has mandated the involvement of and consultation with Native Americans in CRM. This transition has not always been easy but a general trend towards cultural acceptance has helped usher in this new era.

Native American Related Legislation

The American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) was passed in 1978 with the purpose of compelling government agencies to recognize, consider, and respect traditional Native American practices on public lands. AIRFA states:

It shall be policy of the United States to protect and preserve for American Indians their inherit right if freedom to believe, express, and exercise the traditional religions of the American Indian, Eskimo, and Native Hawaiians, including but not limited to access to sites, use and possession of sacred objects, and freedom to worship through ceremonials and traditional rites.

After AIRFA, all CRM laws to follow, including the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979, contained provisions for the considerations of Native American interests in cultural resources. However, the acceptance of these new policies has been highly contested and the constitutionality of these laws is often challenged by claiming that they violate the First Amendment's Establishment Clause (Hutt 2009; Linge 2000; Tsosie 1997). The reluctance to accept these changes in policy is unsurprising given the ideas of governmentality discussed in Chapter 2.

AIRFA as interpreted through *Lyng v. Northwest Indian Cemetery Protective Ass'n* of 1988 continues to be referenced as the “controlling law regarding public land managers’ duty and power to protect Native Americans’ cultural and ceremonial access to sacred sites on public lands” (Cross and Brenneman 1997:34). This case was the first real test of AIRFA and it failed to provide any definite protection of Native American interests. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of the U.S. Forest Service’s G-O Road Project that cut through a Native American ceremonial area because the interests of the Federal agency were “more compelling” than those of the Native Americans. Furthermore, any impacts to cultural resources were deemed

“incidental” and did not violate AIRFA or the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment (Corbin 2002; Cross and Brenneman 1997).

The Supreme Court’s verdict ultimately set the precedent that AIRFA had no legislative power beyond requiring Federal agencies to consider and acknowledge their impacts on Native American sacred sites. In response, legislators proposed amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 to further emphasize the importance of Native American consideration in CRM projects. The 1992 NHPA amendments reminded Federal agencies and land managers that Native Americans and Native Hawaiians needed to be consulted with when identifying, evaluating, and managing cultural resources. Provisions were also made for the creation of Tribal Historic Preservation programs that would mirror the State Historic Preservation programs created by the original version of the NHPA.

Further legislative pressure on Federal agencies to accommodate Native American interests was established in 1996 with Executive Order (EO) 13007. This order directed Federal agencies to accommodate Native American access to and use of culturally sacred sites, as well as to avoid any adverse effects to the integrity of such sites when possible (Dussias 2001; Hutt 2009; King 2008). Executive Order 13007 defines a sacred site as:

Any specific, discrete, narrowly delineated location on Federal land that is identified by an Indian tribe, or Indian individual determined to be an appropriately authoritative representative of an Indian religion, as sacred by virtue of its established religious significance to, or ceremonial use by, an Indian religion.

Many scholars have indicated that while EO 13007 was a promising step towards strengthening AIRFA, the language of the policy makes it difficult to defend in court. Unfortunately, this policy is subject to the same compelling interest clause of AIRFA which states that the needs of the Federal government will often trump the interests of Native

Americans. While this clause is necessary, it must be acknowledged that it also allows for a “loophole” for the implementation of many Federal projects despite CRM laws under the compelling interest argument (Cross and Brenneman 1997).

Native American Worldviews and Landscape Perceptions

The concepts and ideologies of Native Americans are often misinterpreted by non-Natives, especially in hyper-political situations (Harris 2005). Language barriers are often to blame for these misunderstandings because many cultural concepts simply do not translate between cultures and applying inadequate terms can lead to conflict. For example, the term “animism” used by scholars to describe the belief that the world is imbued with a life force is considered an inadequate description by many Native Americans. For them the term simply does not fully articulate the complexities of this belief (Jackson and Stevens 1997).

Scholars, both Native and non-Native, have established several principles that provide the foundation for a generalized Native American worldview. At the base of these worldviews is the belief that the universe, and everything in it, is alive and interconnected. Many Native communities also acknowledge the perpetual movement of space and time in a circular nature that allows for the simultaneous existence of the past, present, and future (Campbell and Foor 2004; Harris 2005; White Deer 1997). Harris (2005:36) further illustrates this image:

It is often said that in the Indigenous view, time is cyclical rather than linear. I conceive of it more as overlapping spirals which can intersect at any place, like a small child's scribbled crayon drawing in three dimensions or a tangled Slinky. The concept of a spiral conveys the idea of regular movement in one direction, while in the Indigenous view one can move through time in any direction if one is powerful enough.

It is easy to see how land managers and non-Native scholars can have a difficult time attempting to fully comprehend the complexities of Native American cultures. As noted earlier, it is from

this traditional knowledge that perceptions about the landscape are created and maintained.

Kluth and Munnell (1997:113) define traditional knowledge as:

...a compilation of the knowledge of tribal culture history, past and present lifeways, language, spirituality, rituals, and ceremonies. This knowledge is gained by living the culture and by listening to the stories and oral histories of elders, parents, and grandparents.

Even if these concepts cannot be understood completely by outsiders, it is important for the differences between cultural worldviews to be acknowledged and included in management decisions.

Furthermore, traditional knowledge does not lead to one, definitive way of viewing the world. “Indigenous knowledge is holistic, rather than reductionist, seeing the universe as a living entity; it is experiential, rather than positivist, contending that experiences which cannot be measured are no less real than those that can be measured” (Harris 2005:37). Oral traditions are widely used among Native American communities in passing along the stories that inspire worldviews. In oral traditions, time and space are not treated in a Western, linear manner; but rather, the implications these stories hold for the present-day cultural descendants and their identity as a community are what are considered important (Anyon et al. 1997). Oral traditions have the ability to simultaneously serve as historical narratives, foundations of belief systems, and behavior guidelines among other things (Harris 2005).

The relationships between Native American cultures and their landscapes are also relayed through traditional knowledge and oral traditions. This relationship is considered “familial” and extremely complex, renewed on a regular basis by ceremonial and daily practices. “The people are the land and the land is the people” (Teeman 2008:628). The landscape provides all essential life resources, such as food, materials for shelter, a source of identity, and a connection with the

spiritual world. No activities take place apart from the landscape and it is constantly a part of their cultural awareness.

Cultural ceremonies are used to renew and balance the relationships between individual humans, humans and the spiritual world, and also humans and the environment. “Sacred power therefore requires a landscape that is intact, alive, and filled with animation. These qualities are as important today as they were in the past” (Campbell and Foor 2004:165). Ceremonies can be seen as a calling forth of non-human beings and the shared experience of these ceremonies is an element of shared identity. There is a partnership with the non-human beings that is acknowledged in ceremonies and is “expressed through the belief that all parties have equal ownership to their place in the universe, and that each has specific rights and responsibilities to ensure that the nature of all is not threatened” (Bastien 1993:92). The rights and responsibilities include sharing, learning, and teaching which are carried out through ceremonies.

Basso’s (1996) ethnographic account of the connection that the Western Apache share with their landscape exemplifies how many Native communities view the landscape. Basso shows how stories and ancestral accounts are indivisibly connected to the land through analyzing how these places remind the community about past lessons learned. One of his informants stated:

Wisdom sits in places. It’s like water that never dries up. You need to drink water to stay alive, don’t you? Well, you also need to drink from places. You must remember everything about them. You must learn their names. You must remember what happened at them long ago. You must think about it and keep on thinking about it. Then your mind will become smoother and smoother. Then you will see danger before it happens. You will walk a long way and live along time. You will be wise. People will respect you (Basso 1996:127).

Landscapes are an integral part of Native American cultural traditions and knowledge. The landscape and its resources are not seen as a commodity subject to “ownership,” but rather as a space full of life and energy to be experienced by all. This is not to say that Native American cultures do not have concepts of territoriality. On the contrary, there are often strict cultural laws about resource access and usage that are understood by those within and around the culture (Leal 1998; Myers 1982). However, these concepts do not conform to the Western ideas of ownership and were often dismissed by Anglo-American settlers.

Furthermore, the landscape is seen by many Native American cultures as inseparable from the rest of the universe. The idea that ceremonial and other significant sites do not occur in isolation is demonstrated in the importance of the viewsheds associated with many of these areas (Dormaar and Reeves 1993). Spirits inhabit rocks, trees, and waterways and a connection to the past is seen through the physical evidence of creation stories. The landscape is representative of cultural identity, a mnemonic device of cultural history, and natural spaces seemingly devoid of human constructions are often just as important as developed areas. Furthermore, the importance of place and space on the landscape cannot be compared; instead, each place has its own importance (Bradley 2000).

Chapter Summary

As noted earlier, these are only generalizations of Native American beliefs and landscape perceptions. Future analysis of landscape perceptions would greatly benefit from incorporating ethnographic information specific to the Native American cultures involved. Consultation with these cultures would also be beneficial when attempting to understand these different beliefs. However, this discussion has clearly shown that landscapes are often seen as more than physical backgrounds for cultural interaction. For Native Americans, landscapes are lived-in and

experienced, as opposed to acted upon. Furthermore, while associated structures and features within a landscape may be significant; it is the place itself along with its connections to the culture that are truly important.

While Anglo-American land and resource managers may not be able to fully grasp the relationships between Native Americans and their landscapes, it is important for them to be acknowledged. It is important to understand that it is not always the physical, tangible elements of a site or landscape that are considered the most significant. Structures and landforms may naturally decay and erode, but the spiritual power of the place remains. Finally, land managers should consider the need many Native Americans feel to physically interact with their traditional landscapes as Campbell and Foor (2004:164) explain:

Traditional northwestern Plains religions, similar to other indigenous religions of Native North America, are cosmotheistic. Within such a worldview, humans, animals, plants, natural objects, and natural phenomena are animated by spiritual power. These animated beings are interrelated through kinship and reciprocal obligations. Through reciprocal kin relations, spirit beings interact with each other, including human beings. Those interactions involve the transfer of power, and they establish a dialogue that must be maintained by ritual prescriptions. These cosmotheistic principles extend themselves as an integral part of the landscape.

Chapter 6: Landscape Perceptions of the National Park Service

As with the Native American perceptions discussed in the previous chapter, the National Park Service (NPS) has its own views and ideas about the characteristics and significance of landscapes. These views are widely based on the ideals of the Anglo-American founders of the NPS and subsequent legislation passed by the United States government in relation to cultural resource management (Vander Stoep and Roggenbuck 1996). This chapter will investigate how these factors have formed the NPS perception of landscapes as tangible, boundary based areas that may have been created by other cultures but have since become the responsibility of the NPS. This chapter will also show that although the NPS appears to be a neutral stakeholder in the management of resources, the system is bureaucratic by design and is often driven by its own beliefs and biases.

The NPS can be considered a cultural entity that has acquired its own landscape perceptions, manifested through management laws and policies. Furthermore, the employees and residents of these national parks include these landscapes as part of their own identities. This further inhibits the NPS from being seen as a neutral stakeholder in the management of cultural landscapes since the agency also has a responsibility to its employees to create a suitable work environment. Some scholars have claimed that the National Park Service is like a business that strives for success, not unlike private corporations, and that this success may come at the expense of cultural resources (Cross and Brenneman 1997; O'Brien 1999).

Historical and other scholarly sources will be used in this chapter to determine the NPS perceptions and concerns about national park landscapes. A discussion of NPS history along with its core responsibilities, followed by the progression of cultural resource management legislation will be given as the basis of NPS beliefs about landscapes and their management. To

conclude the chapter, the specific policies of Glacier National Park will be considered along with a summary of the NPS landscape perceptions.

History and Responsibilities

While the NPS was not created until 1916, areas considered to be national parks were set aside as early as 1872 with the establishment of Yellowstone National Park. The preservation of undeveloped land was an unprecedented and controversial idea when it was proposed at the height of American industrial development. As was discussed in the last chapter, these areas were set aside as national parks only because they were determined to be virtually worthless for commercial undertakings. The designation of “national park” was originally meant to be bestowed on only a few of America’s greatest natural treasures. However, the development of a booming tourism industry in these parks kept the national park program alive and inspired the creation of many more national parks (Eagles and McCool 2002).

Yosemite National Park followed Yellowstone’s lead and was created a few years later, in 1890. Originally, national parks were under the supervision of the United States Departments of Agriculture and War to protect these areas from unauthorized resource exploitation by industrial corporations. However, it soon became evident that these areas also needed protection from park visitors as well. Without enforcement, visitors violated hunting regulations, made souvenirs out of natural resources, and participated in other destructive behaviors. As a result, the U.S. Army was called to police the parks and monitor visitor activities. Based on these events, and similar experiences in other parks, it was purposed that a new Federal agency be created specifically designed to manage the resources and visitors within these national parks (Burnham 2000; Eagles and McCool 2002; O’Brien 1999).

Finally, in 1916 congress passed the Organic Act creating the National Park Service to manage what Secretary Franklin Lane of the Department of Interior called the “national playground system” (Burnham 2000:60). By this time, over 60 areas had already been set aside as national parks and historic areas; however, some of these areas, such as Mackinac Island, were actually decommissioned after the creation of the NPS (O’Brien 1999). While each park was subject to individual management plans and policies of visitor use and resource preservation, the Organic Act provided the basic framework. According to the act:

The service thus established shall promote and regulate the use of the Federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations hereinafter specified by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purpose of the said parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

From this section of the law, it can be seen that the primary concern of the National Park Service is two-fold. Not only must the characteristic resources of each park be preserved, but the NPS must also present these resources for the enjoyment of the people.

While each national park unit is responsible for the management of their resources, the NPS has provided general management guidelines for cultural resources on Federal lands. The NPS stresses the need to identify and thoroughly research all cultural resources within the park’s boundaries for their evaluation based on the criteria of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). If a park is considered significant primarily because of its cultural resources, the entire park is automatically listed in the National Register. However, if the park is considered significant primarily for its natural aspects, cultural resources are individually nominated and listed in the NRHP (NPS 2006).

Once these resources have been identified, the NPS is responsible for making sure that these cultural resources are properly preserved, monitored, and included in management plans. As part of NPS dual responsibility to both protect and promote, these resources must also be made available to the public. Interpretive programs are often developed to enhance the visitor's experience in the park by making these resources more accessible while also providing information about appropriate behavior (O'Brien 1999). In order to fully realize the responsibilities of the NPS, the cultural resource specialists from each park must work in conjunction with other internal departments, such as the natural resource specialists, along with State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs), Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPOs), and other surrounding agencies. Public hearings and consultations with Native American tribes are also held when necessary (NPS 2006).

The NPS, as an agent of the Secretary of the Department of Interior, also monitors and provides advice for CRM compliance practices of other Federal agencies (DOI 1994). The NRHP is also under the management of the NPS along with any other designation lists of national importance. It is for this reason that the NRHP criteria for evaluations are so prominent in the management of cultural resources. Most importantly, this position of management gives the NPS the opportunity to be very influential over the treatment and protection of cultural resources nationwide.

As was mentioned earlier, each individual park is left to fill in the details of specific management plans and policies. For example, the cultural resource management objective of Glacier National Park is "to identify, evaluate, protect, and preserve the park's archaeological, historical, and architectural resources in a manner consistent with legislative and executive requirements, National Park Service Policies, and the perpetuation of the park's natural

resources” (Glacier National Park 1977:13). On the other hand, Glacier’s recreational objective is “to make available diverse opportunities for public recreational activities, such as picnicking, camping, riding, hiking, boating, and sightseeing, in locations and at intensity levels that are compatible with long-term perpetuation of natural and cultural resources” (Glacier National Park 1977:13). Furthermore, these policies are subject to all the overarching cultural resource legislation that has been passed over the last century.

A History of Legislation

The views and landscape perceptions of the National Park Service (NPS) are largely tied to the legislative developments in cultural resource management over the last century. While each park has different resources and management goals, these laws and policies serve as a unifying canon of beliefs and interests about the management of cultural resources as mandated by the Federal government. These influential laws include the Antiquities Act of 1906, National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA), American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA), and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) among others.

In similar ways to Native Americans and other cultures, the landscape perceptions of the NPS are subject to change as new experiences and insights are acquired. While the core beliefs of the NPS are largely based on the ideals of its Anglo-American founders, the agency’s perceptions of landscapes and cultural resources in general have changed over time. These changes have often been in response to the advent of new concerns and issues relating to the management of cultural resources. Furthermore, the language within CRM legislation from the past century articulates this evolution of NPS perceptions and beliefs towards cultural resources.

This section will focus on the Federal government's changing attitudes toward cultural resource ownership, classification, and protection/preservation as indicated in the legislation.

The Antiquities Act of 1906 was the first historic preservation law aimed at protecting areas of archaeological and historic sites of scientific and cultural significance on Federal lands. The primary statute of this law was the prohibition of research and excavation without a permit. These areas were seen as Federal property and any illegal excavation or collection of resources from these areas was seen as destroying and/or stealing Federal property. Furthermore, any items that were legally excavated and collected remained the property of the United States. The Antiquities Act is the basis from which all other cultural resource laws have been created (Burnham 2000; Eagles and McCool 2002; King 2008)

This law also gave the President of the United States the ability to set aside resources of exceptional significance as national monuments. In other words, the President was given permission to seize public and treaty lands of interest as national property. The concerns and interests of Native American cultures were ignored during this process and many tribes were ultimately removed from their traditional homelands (O'Brien 1999; Tsosie 1997). The Federal government assumed all rights to any resources located on these lands under Western concepts of property ownership; negating any previously determined agreements or treaties between the United States government and Native American tribes (Burnham 2000:50).

Western ideas of property ownership dictate the complete and total authority over the land and the resources found there. Moreover, land is seen as commodity to be bought, sold, and traded in a market setting and protected by laws against trespassing and theft. The complete Federal ownership of cultural resources remained an integral part of CRM legislation for many years following the Antiquities Act. However, the reasons for acquiring and protecting these

resources did shift as national parks and monuments became more popular with the American people and the potential profits from tourism were realized. Legislation following the Antiquities Act began to describe cultural resources as not only belonging to the Federal government but also to the American public (Eagles and McCool 2002; O'Brien 1999).

The 1916 Organic Act created the National Park Service for the purpose of preserving and promoting national parks for the enjoyment of present and future generations. While legal ownership of these lands, for all intents and purposes, remained with the Federal government, the NPS advertised these areas as trust lands belonging to the American people (Burnham 2000; Eagles and McCool 2002; O'Brien 1999). During this time, cultural and natural resources were managed based on the tourism interests of the American people, as opposed to the needs of the resources or the cultural interests of Native Americans.

Laws and policies from the decades that followed, such as the Historic Sites Act of 1935, continued to solidify the concept of preserving areas of cultural significance on behalf of the American people. The Historic Sites Act states:

It is hereby declared that it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States.

Congress crafted the patriotic sentiment of this Act during the height of the Great Depression to spark national and cultural pride in America's resources and encourage the American people to reconnect with their proud history. Furthermore, this Act instructed the NPS to actively seek out areas deserving of national park status where, coincidentally, new jobs would be created (King 2008).

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 serves as the backbone of many preservation based programs and procedures within not only Federal agencies but state agencies

as well. Like other laws before it, the NHPA promotes the protection and tourism of significant cultural resources, particularly those associated with American history. However, this Act took historic preservation to a new level with stricter provisions to ensure the protection of significant cultural resources. Federal agencies were now asked to avoid adversely impacting cultural properties eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) whenever possible.

The protocol of the NRHP has already been discussed in previous chapters but the importance of this method of evaluation will be further discussed here. Section 106 of the NHPA and 36 CFR 800 outline the procedures and uses of the NRHP criteria to evaluate cultural resources subject to Federal undertakings. According to Section 106, before all projects involving Federal land, funding, or permits were allowed to proceed, an inventory and evaluation of all cultural resources located within the area of potential effect (APE) must be conducted. Another important aspect of this law is the consideration given to affected communities and interest groups associated with impacted resources. Under NHPA, Federal agencies can be sued by these concerned stakeholders if they feel that their concerns have not been adequately addressed during the planning process.

While these lawsuits are difficult to uphold in a court of law, the ability to hold Federal agencies accountable for their actions toward cultural resources indicates a significant change in the management philosophies of the Federal government. Before NHPA, cultural resources were identified and evaluated solely on the expertise of the Federal government without much input from outside sources. However, under the NHPA the interests and concerns of affiliated stakeholders are included in the identification and evaluation of cultural resources through the consultation process. While this law created a level of accountability for the Federal

management of cultural resources, it lacked any true authority to protect resources from destruction (King 2008; Tsosie 1997).

From this point forward, legislation embraced the importance of including communities in the management process. Many cultural resource specialists also began to realize that the concerns and interests of Native Americans in particular had been overlooked for far too long. The civil rights movements of the 1960s and 1970s had additional influence on the cultural resource legislation of this time, including the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) and Executive Order 13007, which were discussed in the previous chapter. The push for laws that addressed Native American concerns towards cultural resources was partially in response to the persisting control of the Federal government over Native American cultural resources and issues of governmentality.

Landscape Perceptions

The brief review of cultural resource legislature above provides insight into the evolving landscape perceptions of the Federal government, especially with regards to land and heritage ownership. When the park service was created in 1916, national park lands were seen primarily as areas of great symbolic and aesthetic value that lacked profitable resources, such as timber or minerals. These lands, along with their natural and cultural resources, were seen as assets of the Federal government set aside for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people. Any illegal acquisition or destruction of these resources was prosecuted as the theft of Federal property.

As the NPS has matured, its management goals and perceptions have changed. Initially, the success of a park was measured yearly by the number of visitors and the size of the profit margin. Today, managers focus more on the quality of the visitor's experience and the impact of educational programs. Resource protection is also taken more seriously with the restriction of

potentially destructive visitor activities and an increase in educational opportunities that focus on park stewardship. Overall, parks have become more open to sustainable tourism defined as “touristic activity that is small in scale, protect the integrity of local cultures, minimizes negative impacts on the environment and, yet, benefits local economic conditions” (Eagles and McCool 2002:64).

Part of embracing sustainable tourism is allowing some measure of change to occur. Past management policies have often attempted to freeze park landscapes in time to preserve the particular characteristics of one singular timeframe and cultural perspective. However, the NPS is beginning to understand the complexities of national park landscapes and the eminent element of change. Native American involvement in the management of these areas has also increased as changes to legislation have acknowledged the cultural importance of these areas to many Native communities (Eagles and McCool 2002).

Despite these changes in the way national park landscapes are managed, the way in which these landscapes are defined remains primarily the same. As discussed in Chapter 3, the NPS defines “cultural landscape” as “a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with a historic event, activity, or person or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values” (Birnbaum 1994:np). This definition implies that landscapes are considered tangible tracts of land associated with historical events with definable boundaries of land ownership akin to farm plots and state lines. These boundaries are a result of the same Western ideas of land ownership that established the United States.

National parks were acquired by the Federal government through trade, treaty, and purchase making these lands, and consequently their landscapes, commodities. Within these ownership models, the landscape is considered synonymous with the terms “land” and “natural

environment.” By claiming ownership of these areas, the Federal government maintains the rights to prosecute violators of Federal laws and policies relating to these areas. Furthermore, when the NPS uses the phrase “cultural landscape” they are denoting an area that has cultural significance amidst the rest of the regular landscape. The NPS perception that not all landscapes are culturally significant is a key distinction in the landscape perceptions of this stakeholder (Thomas 1993).

Chapter Summary

The landscape perceptions of the NPS both reflect and perpetuate the legislative guidelines that have been provided through CRM laws from the past century. After all, many of these laws and policies are written with the influence of NPS managers. As the principles of these laws have reflected the changes in the way cultural resources are managed, they have also shown the changing ways in which the NPS perceive national park landscapes. While the definition of “landscape” has not changed, the acknowledged characteristics of landscapes have changed. National park landscapes continue to be primarily seen as physical plots of land owned by the United States government but they are also seen as areas with complex histories and cultural relationships.

Increasingly, the NPS is attempting to consider the different landscape perceptions and concerns of the visiting public and Native Americans when creating management plans. Many parks, such as Glacier, have developed strong relationships with local tribes; other parks continue to adjust to the changes in management philosophies. In general, the Western concepts of land ownership and governmentality that created the NPS continue to be rooted in the laws that drive the policies of CRM. This makes accepting the ideologies of different cultures and the possibility of multiple landscapes difficult. “The indigenous view of the landscape as a source of

spiritual knowledge, inseparable from the process of living, remains a foreign construct by Anglo-American standards” (Campbell and Foor 2004:177).

Chapter 7: Landscape Perceptions of the Anglo-American Tourist

Anglo-Americans often have very distinct beliefs and opinions about their rights to access and use public lands, with national park lands being no exception. This stakeholder group is perhaps the most important of the three discussed within this paper as they often have the power to significantly influence the policies of the National Park Service (NPS). This chapter will attempt to dissect these perceptions of this stakeholder by first defining “Anglo-American tourists” and working through their relationship with the NPS and the park lands themselves.

This chapter relies primarily on historical scholarship outlining the relationship of the American public with the NPS. Along with these accounts, information gathered by the Visitor Services Project, conducted by the University of Idaho Parks Study Unit (Littlejohn 1991; Manni et al. 2007), will also be used to address the underlying landscape perceptions and uses of park visitors. These surveys are useful for presenting managers with an inside look at how the park is experienced by its visitors. However, it is important to remember that not all people are represented by these surveys and that the results vary from park to park and from year to year.

Defining “Anglo-American Tourist”

Before the perceptions or history of this stakeholder group can be addressed, its members must be defined. Scholars have struggled to distinguish and define the terms “visitor,” “tourist,” “traveler,” and “local” in a universal way for many years (Bender 1993a; Eagles and McCool 2002; Low 2008). Eagles and McCool (2002:153) promote the use of the following definitions provided by the World Tourism Organization:

- *Tourist*: a person travelling to and staying in a place outside their usual environment (100 miles in USA) for not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes;

- *Entrant*: a person going on to lands and waters of park or protected area for any purpose;
- *Visitor*: a person who visits the lands and waters of a park or protected area for purposes mandated for the area.

Bender (1993a) uses the term “visitor” to encompass all persons entering a national park for mandated purposes. However, she further divides this group into three separate categories; tourists, travelers, and local recreationalists. The difference Bender stresses between tourists and travelers is in their approach to recreation. Tourists are generally individuals and groups that go to parks to sightsee, participate in the ranger-led programs, and purchase souvenirs. Travellers, on the other hand, prefer to avoid the tourism industry and often participate in more unique and challenging experiences, such as rock climbing and backcountry camping.

While the difference between “tourist” and “traveler,” as described by Bender, show important distinctions in the types of visitors a park can attract, this thesis will utilize the broad definition of “visitor” and “tourist” provided by the World Tourism Organization. Therefore, this stakeholder category includes those persons who travel outside of their places of residence to visit a national park for recreational purposes. This category excludes local residents because these individuals will often have different landscape perceptions and concerns relating to the national park as part of their home area. Those individuals, organizations, and companies that use national park recreation or resources for profit and economic benefit are also excluded. However, in an ideal landscape study, these individuals should be considered as an additional stakeholder group that would also include national park concessioners.

The phrase “Anglo-American” refers primarily to those American citizens that prescribe to the canon of Western philosophies believed to be predominate among Euro-descendant Americans. This distinction is an important one based on the concepts described in the previous

chapter dictating that the national parks were originally created for the celebration of American history and for the enjoyment of the American people. Obviously, Anglo-American citizens are not the only visitors to the national parks and other protected areas in this country; in fact, many parks, such as Yellowstone and Yosemite, are in many ways international parks. However, it is the Anglo-American visitors who have the most influence on the decisions and policies carried out within the NPS. Furthermore, it is assumed that these international visitors, while possibly seeking distinctly American experiences, bring with them unique cultural experiences and ideologies that promote a different understanding of landscapes that differ from those discussed here.

Visitor Demographics

In 2010, over 281 million people visited the 394 national park areas within the United States for recreational purposes. Each year, a few of these parks and their visitors are targeted in a Visitor Survey Project sponsored by the Park Studies Unit affiliated with the University of Idaho. These surveys provide an in-depth look at the characteristics of the people who visited that particular park that year. In addition to these statistics, information is also provided about the visitors' reasons for visiting the park and how they felt about the park during their visit. In order to address the issues presented in the Prayer and Fasting Site Project case study, the visitor statistics from Glacier National Park should be the focus of this analysis. Unfortunately, 1990 was the last time this survey was conducted in Glacier, making the visitor data for this park over 20 years old. Therefore, this information will be coupled with data gathered from Yellowstone National Park in 2006 to show the more current trends in national park visitation.

According to the 1990 Visitor Survey Project conducted in Glacier National Park between July 29 and August 4 (85% response rate with 481 returned survey cards), an

overwhelming amount of survey takers were from the United States (85%), and an additional 12% came from Canada. The American visitors came from all over the United States to visit the park, but a sizable 13% came from Montana. These percentages show that visitors to Glacier National Park are, for the most part, non-local U.S. residents (Littlejohn 1991). Furthermore, the report found that an overwhelming majority (71%) of surveyed visitors were families and over half (59%) of the participants were on their first trip to Glacier. Sixty percent of these visitors stayed for one full day or longer to experience the park with 40% staying for three days or more (Littlejohn 1991).

While at the park, visitors participated in a variety of activities including sightseeing (97%), picture taking (89%), wildlife viewing (87%), museum and visitor center visits (72%), day hikes (53%), and shopping (51%) among other activities. However, only 3% of the surveyed population participated in overnight backcountry camping (Littlejohn 1991). These figures indicate that the majority of park visitors participated primarily in those activities characteristic of the tourist industry, as opposed to individualized experiences. In fact, when asked about their primary reason for visiting the park, 65% responded “to view wildlife/scenery;” only 18% responded “to participate in recreation” (Littlejohn 1991).

While the picturesque landscape of Glacier National Park is often considered under environmental management plans, the park is also considered a cultural resource for its importance to the visiting public “as a place to nurture, replenish and restore themselves” (NPS 2007). Included in this distinction are all the aspects associated with the unique experience of being a visitor in Glacier National Park. The powerful and unique scenery of Glacier along with its abundance of wildlife have distinguished this area as a World Heritage Site that speaks to all humankind (Glacier National Park 1999:16).

The Visitor Services Project in Yellowstone was conducted during July 23-29 in 2006 with a 69.4% response rate (903 cards returned). The results from this park study were chosen to supplement the information from Glacier because the park is located in the same general geographical setting and share similar characteristics as a natural resource park with high numbers of visitation each year. Like Glacier, the majority of surveyed visitors (90%) were from the United States traveling in family units (71%). Ninety-five percent of the respondents also identified themselves as “White,” as opposed to “Asian,” “American Indian or Alaskan Native,” “Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander,” or “Black or African American.” The park area (within 150 miles of the park) was considered the destination for 60% of visitors and sightseeing/taking a scenic drive was considered the primary reason for visiting the park by the majority (59%) of surveyed visitors (Manni et al. 2007).

Similar to the results from Glacier, the most popular activities were those that would be considered “tourist” activities by Bender (1993). Sightseeing/taking a scenic drive was the number one activity undertaken at the park (96%). Other similar activities, such as viewing wildlife/bird watching (86%), boardwalk/geyser basin touring (76%), visiting roadside/ trailside exhibits (54%), and visiting park visitor centers/museums (49%), show that visitors did not venture too far off the roadways. However, 31% reported going on day hikes (length not specified); only 1% reported going on overnight backcountry trips (Manni et al. 2007).

While these statistics are useful when analyzing the demographics of park visitors, it is important to acknowledge the self-selecting aspect of the participants who take this survey. Thousands of visitors are asked to participate in this survey each year and many individuals refuse to take the survey card all together or fail to return the completed card after their visit. It can be assumed that those visitors who complete the survey are also those individuals who, given

the chance, would speak up at public hearings about NPS management plans and influence future decisions. Regardless of the reasons these individuals participate in these surveys, the characteristics and opinions of these visitors provide insight into how this stakeholder group perceives national park landscapes.

History of Visitation in National Parks

Throughout the history of the National Park Service (NPS), the interests and desires of “the American People” have been the main priorities when creating and managing national parks. This dedication to the public’s participation in decision making processes has often perpetuated the perception that these areas are part of a “national playground” provided for the enjoyment of the people (Burnham 2000). These notions along with the other Western cultural perceptions of landscapes dictate the way the majority of Anglo-American tourists define national park landscapes. This section will outline the relationship between the public and the NPS by providing a brief history of their interaction.

From the beginning, the benefits to the American people have always been used as a justification for the creation and preservation of national parks. When Yellowstone National Park was created in 1872, the park was “dedicated and set apart as a public park or pleasuring ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people” (Yellowstone Act). While the Act accounts for the preservation of those natural resources and curiosities that characterize this area, those who wrote the law were more concerned with the continued visitation of the American public and not the wellbeing of the resource itself. These subtle aspects of the Yellowstone Act are important since the language of this law set the example for future park legislation including the Organic Act (Eagles and McCool 2002).

Before the 1916 Organic Act, 64 areas had been set aside as national parks under the supervision of the War Department, Agricultural Department, and the Department of the Interior. Monetary investment in the new agency was limited and decisions had to be made about how to best spend the minute funding. The main objective of those in charge during this early period was not the preservation of the resources, but rather the development of tourist facilities in order to attract clientele and income. However, after steady increases in tourism within the national parks, it became evident that the unregulated visitor activities were beginning to have an impact on the resources (O'Brien 1999).

In Yellowstone, the impact of unregulated visitor use of the park, along with illegal activities such as poaching, was especially noticeable. "Visitors hunted, broke up geyser formations for souvenirs, and were careless with fires" (O'Brien 1999:23). When the United States government finally acknowledged the park's cry for help, they sent in the U.S. Army to police the park. The army took control of Yellowstone in 1886 and remained there at Fort Yellowstone for the next thirty years to manage the tourists even after the NPS had been officially created (NPS 2007b). Despite this increase in protection offered for the resources within the original national parks, the enjoyment of the public was still a highly ranked priority on the NPS agenda.

Stephan Mather and Horace Albright, the first directors of the NPS, have been hailed as the fathers of the national park idea. As advocates for the creation of this agency, they stressed the importance of these areas as American resources (Rogers 2007). O'Brien (1999:130) describes the philosophy implemented in these early parks:

In the early days almost anything that would attract people to the park was not only allowed, but encouraged...The policy of the NPS for most of its early history reflected the Mather-Albright policy that the main threat faced by outstanding areas was simply

not being a park. Anything that was done to make park visitors happy, increase their number, and lead to the establishment of more parks was the preservation goal with the largest chance of success.

Mather and Albright passionately believed that the educational and recreational values of these parks were just as important, if not more important, than the preservation of resources. One of their first priorities was to allow automobiles into park lands where they had previously been prohibited, thereby opening new areas to visitors. The advent of the automobile in national parks also required the building of additional infrastructure to accommodate the increase in visitors. Other additions, such as museums, educational publications and activities, and concessionaires, were also incorporated into park planning to attract the visiting public. Soon, visitors, supported by the parks, began to petition for additional amenities that allowed for easier access to resources and a more comfortable experience (Burnham 2000; O'Brien 1999; Rogers 2007).

Development within the parks has continued to focus on attracting visitors by promising not only scenic views of America's treasures but also comfortable, up to date accommodations. The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) of the 1930s and the Mission '66 program of 1966 were key eras in the development and construction of infrastructure in parks across the country. During these periods, new roads, trails, campgrounds, and visitor services were created as a response to visitor complaints and needs. Today, the interests of the public continue to be included in the management process and visitors are offered the opportunity to comment on various plans and actions within the park, including the amount of access allowed to various resources, both cultural and natural (Glacier National Park 1999).

More recently, activists for environmental and historic preservation have brought attention to the negative impacts that still exist as a result of unregulated visitor use of resources. Many of the new and continuing management and preservation issues in National Parks stem from the increasing numbers of visitors to these areas. While the enjoyment and well-being of the people have been seen as more important than the well-being of the resource, changes in Federal government ideologies have led to new legislation and policies to further preserve resources (Eagles and McCool 2002). Some policies have been created that are specifically aimed at protecting resources from the visitors by prohibiting certain recreational activities and setting use limits.

As a matter of law, the ability of the NPS to regulate visitor activity is clear. Several laws and policies, including the 1916 Organic Act, allow NPS personnel to prohibit and regulate certain public activities that may adversely affect cultural resources or cause conflict with other park policies (Glacier National Park 1999). However, according to NPS management policies, “only those activities that are inspired by and associated with the park resources are to be allowed, with the exception of additional activities that do not have undesirable impacts of the landscape or other visitor’s experiences” (O’Brien 1999:130). Based on this nondescript policy, any and all activities could potentially be allowed within national parks as long as “undesirable impacts” go undetected.

Controversial recreation policies are abundant throughout the NPS. The root of these conflicts is often based in the process of determining the potential level of adverse impacts created by recreational activities and how much impact should be considered too much. For example, the Winter Use Management Plan in Yellowstone regarding the prohibition of personal snowmobile use is highly contested. Similarly, the establishment of no commercial fly-zones

over many national park areas to minimize noise and viewshed pollution have also caused outcry from many in the tourism industry. The ability of the NPS to regulate these recreational activities is based in the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

Section 304 of the NHPA was amended in 1992 to grant NPS superintendents the authority to withhold specific site location information, particularly relating to archaeological sites, from the public as a measure of added protection (Johnson 2009). The park is allowed to withhold information from the public to protect historic properties only after consultation with the Secretary of the Department of the Interior. The Secretary must determine that disclosure may “cause significant invasion of privacy, risk harm to the historic resource, and/or impede the use of a traditional religious site by practitioners” (NPS 1992). However, despite these changes in policy, the public’s opinions and ideas of what a national park should be continue to be highly considered in management decisions. The perceptions and pillars of these opinions and beliefs are discussed in the next sections.

The Importance of Public Opinion

The support and appreciation of the Anglo-American tourist is essential to the continuation of the NPS. “Park visitation is critical to the creation of societal culture conducive to parks” (Eagles and McCool 2002:23). Without strong public support, the government will not continue to set aside additional parks or fund already existing park entities. It is the perceived significance and aesthetics communities attach to landscapes that push these areas to become national parks in the first place. The values ascribed to these landscapes are generally more focused on the recreational and psychological benefits that these landscapes possess, as opposed to the wealth of tangible resources, such as minerals, timber, or hydroelectric power (Eagles and McCool 2002).

Land managers are paying special attention to current trends in recreation and landscape values. Scholars Lowenthal (1968) and Muir (1999) have noted that physical environments and perceived landscapes come in and out of style. Currently:

American tastes in landscape are said to be characterised [sic] by a general preference for the wilderness over culturally modified scenery, for important and widely celebrated views and for spectacular landforms existing on the grandest scales (Muir 1999:191).

Keeping this trend in mind, parks are currently marketing to the healthy lifestyle demographic by emphasizing a wealth of recreational opportunities and the benefits of communing with nature (Eagles and McCool 2002). Similarly, national parks are also appealing to the environmentally conscious demographic by publicizing the successes of resource rehabilitation projects and future plans to make guest services more eco-friendly.

Individuals who do not live in or around parks are advocates for national parks because they provide areas where they can achieve health benefits, participate in a social and, at times, patriotic experiences, support and promote the conservation of resources, reaffirm personal beliefs and, gain life enhancing personal and family experiences. In some cases, the visiting of national parks can be seen as a type of pilgrimage. Meanwhile, local communities support national parks not only for the economic incentives these areas provided, but also for the conservation of naturally and culturally important areas, the maintenance of cultural identity, and the promotion of recreation and other health benefits. They may also see the presence of national parks as a way to enhance community development, provide additional employment opportunities, and expand global awareness and appreciation of the area (Eagles and McCool 2002).

Perceptions of National Parks

In this section, the information gathered from the visitor surveys and the American public's relationship with the NPS will be drawn together to provide insight into the way the Anglo-American tourist perceives the national park landscape. In many ways these perceptions mirror those of the NPS because both stakeholders are grounded in Western philosophies about land ownership. Additionally, it is the opinions of the Anglo-American majority that often influence the policies and perceptions of Federal agencies. While there is a clear cycle of influence between these two stakeholders, there are also stark contrasts as each group has established a different relationship with national park landscapes.

Many Anglo-Americans find the term "landscape" to be synonymous with the natural environment or the wilderness. The landscape is a physical entity that is the result of a millennia of natural and, at times, cultural processes that have created the current state of the land. Regardless of the forces that created these lands, national park landscapes are defined by the arbitrary boundaries established when these parks were created. However, unlike the perceptions of the NPS, Anglo-American perceptions of landscapes include more than the physical components of the natural environment; landscapes can also incite memories, emotions, and feelings of pride or appreciation. The landscapes within national parks particularly may bring about feelings of national pride, ownership, and freedom.

Parks, such as Glacier and Yellowstone, have specific appeals to many Anglo-Americans that are directly connected to their perceptions of these landscapes. "People visit parks with goals in mind. These goals are highly personal, but in mass also represent societal goals. It is important that park planners and managers understand the intentions of visitors" (Eagles and McCool 2002: 2). Similar to how they were advertised in the early days, many national park

visitors continue to view these landscapes as pleasuring grounds for leisure activities and personal benefit. Eagles and McCool (2002) have noted that the American public perceives wilderness areas as places for personal reflection, leisure, and a reconnection to the natural world. The wilderness is considered a place removed from normal life; where humans are not the dominate species.

Recreational activities are the primary way in which non-local visitors experience and interact with national park landscapes. “The ultimate aim of visiting a national park is, to many people, the study and enjoyment of nature” (O’Brien 1999:145). As the statistics from the visitor surveys showed, these recreational activities do not have to be physically demanding although they have been traditionally defined that way (Eagles and McCool 2002; Littlejohn 1991; Manni et al. 2007). Sightseeing is consistently the number one way visitors recreate within national parks. While this activity is often done from within the comfort of a motorized vehicle, a small percentage of visitors do experience the national parks through hiking and backpacking (Littlejohn 1991; Manni et al. 2007; O’Brien 1999).

Whether the visitor is hiking, biking, or driving their way through a national park, the freedom to participate in their recreational activities of choice is perhaps the most important aspect. This point is further emphasized by Eagles and McCool (2002:99):

Visits by tourists to national parks occur during their leisure time. An essential ingredient of leisure time is the freedom to choose where, when, and how to recreate... This need for freedom is important in designing management actions to minimize obvious effects on this pursuit.

This sense of “freedom” to recreate in national parks is connected with the feelings of ownership that were discussed earlier. The majority of Anglo-American citizens would consider the enjoyment of, and freedom in, national parks to be inherit rights. However, this sentiment can

create conflict when management personnel attempt to implement restrictions and regulations on visitor activities for the preservation of cultural and natural resources.

As was noted earlier, the majority of the Anglo-American visitor population is currently drawn to wilderness areas where they can step away from their normal life and reconnect with nature. However, this experience can be easily tainted by too much interaction with other visitors or the presence of too much infrastructure. When available recreational opportunities do not satisfy their expectations, visitors may partake in different activities which may or may not be in accordance with management plans. O'Brien (1999) believes that because visitation numbers to national parks are increasing, it is becoming more difficult for recreationalists to escape into "wilderness" areas. Therefore, people opt to hike off-trails and away from designated areas, causing adverse impacts to natural and cultural resources, in search of what they expected from the national park experience.

According to the 2008 mass Visitor Services Project report, 97% of 32,883 visitors in 313 park sites were satisfied with the recreational opportunities provided by the NPS in parks (University of Idaho 2008). The same was reflected in the 1990 survey from Glacier National Park where several "General Impressions" comments showed that the surveyed population enjoyed their visit, especially the aspects of peace, solitude, and relaxation (Littlejohn 1991). However, a negative comment that appears again and again on these surveys is the issue of visitor overcrowding. Surprisingly, many surveyed individuals suggested not that the park create more infrastructures to accommodate growing numbers, but rather that the NPS limit the numbers of visitors allowed into the park and the size of personal vehicles (Littlejohn 1991).

Chapter Summary

Anglo-American tourists travel to national parks with certain perceptions and expectations in mind. Many of these perceptions are based on the way these areas have been portrayed in advertisements and legislation supported by the NPS. While recreational regulations do exist for the purpose of preserving the characteristic resources of these parks, managers are also careful to consider the desires of the Anglo-American tourist. Without the support of this stakeholder group, the national park system as an institution of American pride and preservation would begin to falter. For this reason, it is of the utmost importance for managers to understand the landscape perceptions of the Anglo-American tourists.

In review, the evidence provided by the Visitor Survey Project and other scholarship shows that each national park, in its entirety, is seen as a landscape with definable boundaries that separate it from its surrounding areas. Western concepts of property ownership apply to these landscapes as well; although, the American public generally feels a level of ownership for these lands as they have been designated as “public lands.” Furthermore, visitors go to national parks with specific goals and expectations. National parks are unique and inspiring areas that promote recreation and leisure, but also sentiments of freedom, pride, and a reconnection to nature.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

This thesis has examined the ways in which landscapes have been theorized, researched, managed, and perceived in relation to the results from the Prayer and Fasting Site Project from Glacier National Park. In order to address the issues presented in this case study, current landscape management approaches were described and critiqued based on the theoretical concepts established in Chapter 2. Four principles, taken from a proposed landscape paradigm, were presented as core characteristics of any landscape. According to these principles, landscapes are cultural products that are both holistic and universal, as well as subject to inevitable change. Beyond these basic understandings, each landscape is unique and defined primarily by cultural beliefs.

In summary, it was determined that the approaches presented in Chapter 4 inadequately address the complexity of cultural landscapes, especially with regards to recognizing different landscape perceptions. Throughout this discussion of landscapes, concepts and examples of governmentality were incorporated to situate the seemingly narrow mindedness of many government actions. Acknowledging the difficulty Federal agencies and other cultural entities have in accepting landscape perceptions and interests apart from their own supports the hypothesis that these differences are often a source of management conflict. Furthermore, the concept that each cultural group constructs a unique cognitive landscape perception supports the hypothesis that a manager's true goal is not to manage one landscape with multiple stakeholders, but rather multiple landscapes occupying one geographical area simultaneously.

Based on the analysis summarized above, it can be deduced that the impacts to the prayer and fasting sites in Glacier are due primarily to the differences in landscape perceptions and expectations between Native American cultures, the National Park Service, and the Anglo-

American tourist. Many Native American groups continue to associate the area of Glacier National Park with their homeland and as an area of cultural identity. The physical and spiritual interaction with this landscape continues to be important for everyday affirmations of cultural beliefs and relationships with the world and the beings and forces therein.

On the other hand, the NPS perceives the area of Glacier National Park as a definable, tangible space subject to the ownership concepts of the Western world and a place to be managed and developed for the benefit of the American people. These ideas of the Glacier landscape and its significance are manifested and defined by legislative policies dictated by the U.S. government. Undoubtedly, this agency is open to the opinions and concerns of other cultures, as demonstrated by the various landscape approaches employed by government agencies and discussed in Chapter 4. However, the NPS needs to recognize that different cultures perceive different landscapes based on their cultural values and beliefs.

Finally, the Anglo-American tourist has been defined as those park visitors who are non-local American citizens of European descent. These individuals also ascribe to Western ideas and philosophies; projecting landscape perceptions and expectations that are based on their ideals of freedom and leisure. Tourists come to national parks to relax on family vacations; Native American communities associate these areas with spiritual and ancestral powers. It is this clash of landscape perceptions and expectations that is often the source of conflict in Glacier and other national parks. For example, the building of summit cairns can be seen as the visitors' way of making intangible experiences tangible; Native Americans see the cairns as acts of desecration.

Since the NPS views these lands as areas to be managed, the agency is responsible for finding a solution to these landscape conflicts. Chapter 4 presented a few of the landscape management approaches that have been used both within the NPS and in other agencies.

Throughout that chapter it became clear that many of these approaches failed to fully acknowledge the complexity of landscapes, especially the possibility of simultaneously existing landscapes. While many of these approaches contribute to CRM in one way or another, the full recognition of different cultural perceptions of landscapes would be beneficial.

Chapters 5, 6, and 7 exemplified the differences in landscape perceptions and expectations that exist between Native American communities, the NPS, and the Anglo-American tourist. The significance of the information generated by these chapters is the ability to compare and contrast the interests of each stakeholder which allows managers to pin point areas of potential conflict. In Glacier, the key point of contention, outlined earlier, is the building of summit cairns by park tourists out of prayer and fasting site areas intended for ceremonial purposes. The following section discusses possible ways to manage these conflicts and also demonstrates the efficiency and effectiveness of indirect management through the Devils Tower case study.

Types of Management and the Devils Tower Case Study

Inadvertent, uninformed, and careless impacts to resources will always be present in areas of high tourism. However, the rate of these instances can be decreased through attempts to further educate visitors of park rules and the consequences of harmful actions. McCool and Christensen (1996) along with Vander Stoep and Roggenbuck (1996) have researched the efficiency of management strategies within areas such as national parks. Both parties specifically tested the acceptability of direct verses indirect strategies among park visitors:

Direct strategies rely on regulation of behavior, while indirect strategies emphasize information and education. Because direct methods regulate or control visitor behavior through relatively intrusive measures, their use has important consequences for perceived freedom-a primary value of leisure activity in dispersed in backcountry settings (McCool and Christensen 1996:68).

In other words, direct strategies are laws and policies that can result in punishment for offenders; indirect strategies focus on attempting to influence the decisions of visitors rather than force them.

In Chapter 7, the retention of control and freedom by national park visitors was highlighted as an important characteristic related to the landscape expectations of Anglo-American tourists. McCool and Christensen (1996:69) have found that “by retaining the locus of control within the visitor, indirect measures provide a context within which the visitor retains the sense of freedom important to recreation experiences.” Indirect approaches are successful because they use education to promote changes in cultural perceptions, particularly the acceptance of other cultural perceptions and beliefs. This is supported by McCool and Christensen’s (1996) research which showed that visitors were more likely to accept suggested regulations when they understood the reasons for the policies and/or could see the immediate benefits of the policies.

Devils Tower National Monument is an excellent example of successful indirect management strategies used to protect the interests of Native American cultures. Devils Tower was the first section of public land to be set aside as a national monument after the passage of the Antiquities Act of 1906. This area is known as a geological marvel and a world class climbing challenge for many adventurers. The Tower’s featured role in the film *Close Encounters of the Third Kind* has also had a major impact on the visitation of this area (Rogers 2007). Nearly 400,000 individuals visited the Monument in 2009 and it is estimated that more than 5,000 visitors climb the Tower every year (Devils Tower 2001; NPS 2010).

The staff at Devils Tower acknowledges the social, religious, and ideological importance of the Tower's landscape to Native American cultures. As many as 29 tribes have claimed cultural affiliation to the Tower and at least six of those tribes (the Kiowa, Cheyenne, Eastern Shoshone, Crow, Arapaho, and Lakota nations) have inhabited the area at some point in their histories. Cultural practices at the Tower, known to predate European arrival, include leaving prayer bundles and prayer offerings along with holding Sun Dances, sweats, and vision quests (Dussais 2001). Despite the acknowledgement of the continued importance of this area to Native communities, the interests of Anglo-American tourists have often remained the primary basis for management decisions.

In 1995, the Superintendent of Devils Tower National Monument (Deborah Liggett) approved a management plan that would further protect Native American interests at the Monument while restricting recreational rock climbing. The Draft Climbing Management Plan (DCMP) of 1994 is noteworthy as the first managerial response of the NPS to minimize cultural and environmental damages caused by previously unregulated recreational climbing. The change in management policies was prompted by the outcry of several Native American tribes that their cultural practices and access to the Monument were being compromised (Cross and Brenneman 1997; Devils Tower 1995). They also believed that the climbing of the Tower was desecrating the spiritual nature of the feature in such a way that many spiritual beings had decided to leave the area (Dussias 2001).

In response to the adverse impacts to the Tower, the DCMP called for a voluntary ban on climbing the Tower during the month of June. The management plan highlighted the month of June because this time was considered to be the height of spiritual ceremonies during the calendar year for many Native American tribes. Furthermore, the NPS decided it would abide by

its own voluntary restriction by refusing to issue permits to commercial climbing companies. This refusal to issue permits infuriated many local recreational companies and the NPS regulation was tested before court. After a long legal battle, it was decided that it was constitutional for the NPS to issue a voluntary climbing ban during the month of June but that it was in violation of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to withhold climbing permits from commercial companies. The grounds for this decision were based on the argument that refusing to issue permits for the protection of Native American religious practices was effectively the unconstitutional establishment of religion by the Federal government (Cross and Brenneman 1997).

The Final Climbing Management Plan (FCMP) was approved in 1995 with the provision that the NPS would in no way attempt to restrict or prohibit the freedom of individuals and companies to climb the Tower. However, the voluntary climbing ban during June remained and awareness and education of the reasons and benefits for this decision became the primary goal of the NPS (Devils Tower 1995). The program produced encouraging results. Before the plan was implemented in 1995, 1,293 individuals had climbed the Tower during June 1994 alone. In June of 1995 only 193 climbers were reported. The number of climbers during June continues to remain significantly lower and it has been reported that climbing during the month of June has been permanently reduced by at least 80% as a result of the voluntary climbing ban and associated education programs (NPS 2010).

Updates were made to the climbing plan in 2006, eleven years after the FCMP was implemented. The updates focus primarily on improving the features of the FCMP which were already in place. A Climber Registration Office was created in 2005 to create further climber awareness of the stipulations under the FCMP through educational programs outlining safety

precautions and the importance of the Tower to Native American cultures. Upon NPS review and public comment, the voluntary June climbing ban continues to be implemented as a positive compromise to a sensitive issue. The park feels that the public's acceptance of this ban is in large part due to the increased education that is provided by the Monument about associated Native American cultures and traditions (Devils Tower 2006).

The Devils Tower FCMP is a positive example of conflict resolution where cultures clash over the use of national park lands. The voluntary ban came as the result of many meetings between NPS officials, Native American cultures, and the concerned public. During these meetings, management officials acknowledged that different people perceive the Monument in different ways and consequently seek different experiences from their interaction with it and the surrounding landscape. Both the visiting public and the Native American cultures indicated a need to be physically close to the Tower but for very different reasons. Once these different perceptions and expectations were fully addressed, the NPS could move forward to find a satisfactory solution.

The true value of this case study is in the documentation of the successful use of indirect management strategies. Public education is the key to the voluntary climbing ban and any other management policies like it. The success of this indirect approach to management is related to the ability to communicate effectively to the public and other concerned parties about the reasons and benefits of the policies being implemented or suggested. This is done by effectively understanding the perceptions of the involved groups and adequately explaining the perceptions of other groups. Time will tell if this indirect approach to management will continue to remain so successful at Devils Tower, but for now the voluntary ban remains in effect and visitors in general have a greater awareness of the importance of the area to Native American cultures.

Overcrowding and congestion in parks such as Yellowstone, Yosemite, and Glacier is another park issue that benefits from indirect management. As park visitation continues to grow, these issues will only become worse. Many managers and activists alike have supported changes in management plans that would ultimately limit the number of park visitors allowed within the park, or in certain areas, at any given time. However, this is not an easy choice as Eagles and McCool (2002:135) explain:

Limiting access to national parks and protected areas is one of the most controversial aspects of management. The controversy compromises a constellation of closely related issues that often embrace national philosophies regarding freedom, the role the government in controlling behavior, cultural norms on access to public lands and how local communities relate to national parks.

Although this management policy appears to go against the desires of park visitors and other stakeholders the surprising response to this issue revealed at the end of the last chapter provides evidence to the contrary. The reason for this contradiction is based in the visitor's ability to understand the issue and the resulting options, which may be a result of educational programs and personal experiences.

The landscape perceptions of different cultures are often a source of conflict on national park lands. Cases like Devils Tower and the Prayer and Fasting Site Project can and have greatly benefitted from management plans that attempt to discover the underlying conflicts associated with these landscapes. Ideally, the comparison of landscape perceptions would result in the realization that landscape conflicts can be addressed through indirect management strategies, such as education and cultural awareness. Therefore, the proposed plan of action for the Prayer and Fasting Site case is two-fold: 1) educate the public regarding the importance of the national park area to Native Americans along with the consequences of their actions, and 2) continue monitoring the impacts at these sites to measure the effectiveness of this increased education.

References

ACHP-Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

- 2008 *National Register Evaluation Criteria*. <http://www.achp.gov/nrcriteria.html>, accessed December 2010.

Allison, John

- 1999 Self-determination in Cultural Resource Management: Indigenous People's Interpretation of History and of Places and Landscapes. In *The Archaeology and Anthropology of Landscape: Shaping Your Landscape*. Peter J. Ucko and Robert Layton, eds. Pp. 264-283. London: Routledge.

Anschuetz, Kurt F.

- 2007 The Valles Caldera National Preserve as a Multi-Layered Ethnographic Landscape. In *More than a Scenic Mountain Landscape: Valles Caldera National Preserve Land Use History*. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-196. Pp. 129-162. Fort Collins: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, and Rocky Mountain Research Station.

Anschuetz, Kurt F., Richard H. Wilshusen, and Cherie L. Scheick

- 2001 An Archaeology of Landscapes: Perspectives and Directions. *Journal of Archaeological Research*, 9:157-211.

Anyon, Roger, TJ Ferguson, Loretta Jackson, Lillie Lane, and Philip Vicenti

- 1997 Native American Oral Tradition and Archaeology: Issues of Structure, Relevance, and Respect. In *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground*. Nina Swidler, Kurt E. Dongoske, Rodger Anyon, and Alan S. Downer, eds. Pp. 77-87. Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press.

Ashmore, W

- 2004 Social Archaeologies of Landscape. In *A Companion to Social Archaeology*. L. Meskell and R.W. Preucel, eds. Pp. 255-271. Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

Basso, Keith H.

- 1996 *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language among the Western Apache*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico.

Bastien, Betty

- 1993 Sacred Relationships and Sacred Places of Tribal People. In *Kunaitupii: Coming Together on Native Sacred Sites*. B.O.K. Reeves and M.A. Kennedy, eds. Pp 91-95. Calgary: Archaeological Society of Alberta.

Bender, Barbara

- 1993a Stonehenge-Contested Landscapes (Medieval to Present-Day). In *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*. Barbara Bender, ed. Pp.245-280. Providence: Berg.
- 1993b Introduction: Landscape-Meaning and Action. In *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*. Barbara Bender, ed. pp. 1-18. Providence: Berg.

Birnbaum, Charles A.

- 1994 *Preservation Brief 36-Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes*, <http://www.cr.nps.gov/hps/tps/briefs/brief36.htm>., accessed February 23, 2011.

Blake, Janet

- 2009 UNESCO's 2003 *Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage*: The Implications of Community Involvement in 'Safeguarding.' In *Intangible Heritage*. Laurajane Smith and Natsuko Akagawa, eds. Pp. 45-73. London: Routledge.

Bradley, Richard

- 2000 *An Archaeology of Natural Places*. London: Routledge.

Brown, Nancy, David Hasty, Tom Keohan, and Lee Terzis

- 2001 More than a Database: The National Park Service's Cultural Landscapes Inventory Improves Resource Stewardship. In *Crossing Boundaries in Park Management: Proceedings of the 11th Conference on Research and Resource Management in Parks and on Public Lands*. David Harmon, ed. Pp. 311-315. The George Wright Society, Inc.

Burnham, Philip

- 2000 *Indian Country, God's Country: Native Americans and the National Parks*. Washington D.C.: Island Press.

Campbell, Gregory R. and Thomas A. Foor

- 2004 Entering Sacred Landscapes: Cultural Expectations Verses Legal Realities in the Northwestern Plains. *Great Plains Quarterly* 24 (Summer): 163-183.

Carman, John

- 1996 Object Values: Landscapes and Their Contexts. In *Landscapes: Perception, Recognition and Management-Reconciling the Impossible? Conference Proceedings* April 2-4. Melvyn Jones and Ian D. Rotherham., eds. Pp. 31-34. Sheffield: Wildtrack Publishing.

Chapman, Henry

2006 *Landscape Archaeology and GIS*. Stoud: TEMPUS.

Clark, Bonnie J. and Laura L. Scheiber

2008 A Sloping Land: An Introduction to Archaeological Landscapes on the High Plains. In *Archaeological Landscapes on the High Plains*. Laura L. Scheiber and Bonnie J. Clark, eds. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.

Cosgrove, Denis

1984 *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape*. London: Croom Helm.

Cross, Raymond and Elizabeth Brenneman

1997 Devil's Tower at the Crossroads: The National Park Service and Preservation of Native American Cultural Resources in the 21st Century. *Public Land and Resources Law Review* 18: 5-45.

Corbin, Amy

2002 *The G-O Road*. Sacred Land Film Project. <http://www.sacredland.org/g-o-road/>, accessed April 24, 2011.

David, Bruno and Julian Thomas

2008 Landscape Archaeology: Introduction. In *Handbook of Landscape Archaeology*, Bruno David and Julian Thomas, eds. Pp. 27-43. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press Inc.

Darvill, Timothy

1996 Landscapes: Myth or Reality? *Landscapes: Perception, Recognition and Management-Reconciling the Impossible? Conference Proceedings* April 2-4. Melvyn Jones and Ian D. Rotherham, eds. Pp. 9-17. Sheffield: Wildtrack Publishing.

1999 The Historic Environment, Historic Landscapes, and Space-Time-Action Models in Landscape Archaeology. In *The Archaeology and Anthropology of Landscape: Shaping Your Landscape*. Peter J. Ucko and Robert Layton, eds. Pp.104-118. London: Routledge.

2002 *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Archaeology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Department of Interior (DOI)

1994 *DOI Policy on the Protection of Cultural Resources (519 DM 1)*, <http://www.nps.gov/policies>, accessed November 5, 2009.

Devils Tower National Monument

1995 *Final Climbing Management Plan/ Finding of No Significant Impact*. <http://www.nps.gov/deto/planyourvisit/climbing>, accessed February 3, 2011.

- 2001 *Final General Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement*.
<http://www.nps.gov/deto/parkmgmt/devils-tower-general-management-plan.htm>,
 accessed February 5, 2011.
- 2006 *News Release: Devils Tower National Monument Climbing Management Plan Update Completed*. <http://www.nps.gov/deto/planyourvisit/climbing>, accessed
 February 3, 2011.
- Dormaar, John
- 1988 Waiting for a Vision. *The Explorers Journal* 66:144-149.
- 2002 Vision Questing in Glacier National Park, Montana. *Archaeology of Montana*
 43(1): 1-14.
- Dormaar, John F and Brian O. Reeves
- 1993 Vision Quest Sites in Southern Alberta and Northern Montana. In *Kunatiupii – Coming Together on Native Sacred Sites*. B.O.K. Reeves and M.A. Kennedy, eds. Pp. 162-178. Calgary: Archaeological Society of Alberta.
- Dower, Michael
- 1997 The Appraisal and Protection of Cultural Landscapes: The Proposed European Landscape Convention. In *Perception and Evaluation of Cultural Landscapes. Proceedings of an International Symposium*. P. N. Doukellis and L. G. Mendoni, eds. Pp. 263-271. Zakynthos.
- Dussias, Allison M.
- 2001 Cultural Conflicts Regarding Land Use: The Conflict between Recreational Users at Devil's [sic] Tower and Native American Ceremonial Users. *Res Communes* 2: 13-40.
- Eagles, Paul F.J and Stephen F. McCool
- 2002 *Tourism in National Parks and Protected Areas: Planning and Management*. New York: CABI Publishing.
- Eide, Emily
- 2010 *Evaluating and Understanding the Effects of Public Access and Natural Processes on Prayer and Fasting Sites in Glacier National Park*. Unpublished report, Glacier National Park.
- Fairclough, Graham
- 1996 Assessment and Characterisation [sic]: English Heritage's Approach to the Historic Landscape. In *Landscapes: Perception, Recognition and Management-Reconciling the Impossible? Conference Proceedings* April 2-4. Melvyn Jones and Ian D. Rotherham, eds. Pp. 43-51. Sheffield: Wildtrack Publishing.

- 1999 Protecting Time and Space: Understanding Historic Landscape for Conservation in England. In *The Archaeology and Anthropology of Landscape: Shaping Your Landscape*. Peter J. Ucko and Robert Layton, eds. Pp119-134. London: Routledge.
- 2008a 'The Long Chain:' Archaeology, Historical Landscape Characterization and Time Depth in the Landscape. In *The Heritage Reader*. Graham Fairclough, Rodney Harrison, John H. Jameson Jnr., and John Schofield, eds. Pp. 408-424. New York: Routledge.
- 2008b New Heritage, an Introductory Essay-People, Landscape and Change. In *The Heritage Reader*. Graham Fairclough, Rodney Harrison, John H. Jameson Jnr., and John Schofield, eds. Pp. 297-312. New York: Routledge.
- Feinman, Gary M.
- 1999 Defining a Contemporary Landscape Approach: Concluding Thoughts. *Antiquity* 73: 684-685.
- Gilmore, Kevin P.
- 2008 Ritual Landscapes Population and Changing Sense of Place During the Late Prehistoric Transition in Eastern Colorado. In *Archaeological Landscapes on the High Plains*, Laura L. Scheiber and Bonnie J. Clark, eds. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.
- Glacier National Park
- 1977 *Glacier National Park/ Montana Final Master Plan*, http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/glac/final_master_plan/index.htm, accessed November 28, 2009.
- 1999 *Final General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement: Glacier National Park*, <http://www.nps.gov/glac/parkmgmt/planning.htm>, assessed November 28, 2009.
- Harris, Heather
- 2005 Indigenous Worldviews and Ways of Knowing as Theoretical and Methodological Foundations for Archaeological Research. In *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice* Claire Smith and H. Martin Wobst, eds. Pp. 33-41. London: Routledge.
- Hicks, Dan and Laura McAtackney
- 2007 Introduction: Landscapes as Standpoints. In *Envisioning Landscape: Situations and Standpoints in Archaeology and Heritage*. Dan Hicks, Laura McAtackney, and Graham Fairclough, eds. Pp13-29. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

- Hood, J. Edward
 1996 Social Relations and the Cultural Landscape. In *Landscape Archaeology: Reading and Interpreting the American Historical Landscape*. Rebecca Yamin and Karen Bescherer Metheny, eds. Pp. 121-146. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press.
- Hutt, Sherry
 2009 The Evolution of Federal Agency Authority to Manage Native American Cultural Sites. *The George Wright Forum* 26 (1): 45-56.
- Jackson, Loretta and Robert H. ("Hank") Stevens
 1997 Hualapai Tradition, Religion, and the Role of Cultural Resource Management. In *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground*. Nina Swidler, Kurt E. Dongoske, Rodger Anyon, and Alan S. Downer, eds. Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press.
- Jameson, John H., Jr.
 2008 Cultural Heritage Management in the United States. In *The Heritage Reader*. Graham Fairclough, Rodney Harrison, John H. Jameson Jr., and John Schofield, eds. Pp. 42-61. New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, Lon
 2009 Personal Communication, Glacier National Park Culture Resources Specialist.
- Johnson, Matthew
 2007 *Ideas of Landscape*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kelly, Kenneth G. and Neil Norman
 2007 Historical Archaeologies of Landscape in Atlantic Africa. In *Envisioning Landscape: Situations and Standpoints in Archaeology and Heritage*. Dan Hicks, Laura McAtackney, and Graham Fairclough, eds. Pp. 172-193. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- King, Thomas F.
 2002 *Thinking about Cultural Resource Management: Essays from the Edge*. New York: AltaMira.
 2008 *Cultural Resource Laws & Practice*. 3rd Edition. New York: AltaMira.
- Kluth, Rose and Kathy Munnell
 1997 The Integration of Tradition and Scientific Knowledge on the Leech Lake Reservation. In *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground*. Nina Swidler, Kurt E. Dongoske, Rodger Anyon, and Alan S. Downer, eds. Pp. 112-119. Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press.

Lambrick, George

- 1992 The Importance of the Cultural Heritage in a Green World: Towards the Development of Landscape Integrity Assessment. In *All Natural Things: Archaeology and the Green Debate*. Lesley MacInnes and Caroline R. Wickham-Jones, eds. Pp. 105-126. Oxbow Books: Oxbow.

Lane, Paul J.

- 2008 The Use of Ethnography in Landscape Archaeology. In *Handbook of Landscape Archaeology*. Bruno David and Julian Thomas, eds. Pp. 237-244. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press Inc.

Lawson, Andrew J.

- 1997 Perception and Evaluation of Historic Landscapes: The Contribution of Rescue Archaeology in Britain. In *Perception and Evaluation of Cultural Landscapes. Proceedings of an International Symposium*. P. N. Doukellis and L. G. Mendoni, eds. Pp. 17-25. Zakynthos.

Layton, Robert and Peter J. Ucko

- 1999 Introduction: Grazing on the Landscape and Encountering the Environment. In *The Archaeology and Anthropology of Landscape: Shaping Your Landscape*. Peter J. Ucko and Robert Layton, eds. Pp. 1-18. London: Routledge.

Lazzari, Marisa

- 2008 Topographies of Values: Ethical Issues in Landscape Archaeology. In *Handbook of Landscape Archaeology*. Bruno David and Julian Thomas, eds. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press Inc.

Leal, Donald R.

- 1998 Community-Run Fisheries: Avoiding the "Tragedy of the Commons." *Population and Environment* 19:3, 225-245.

Linge, George

- 2000 Ensuring the Full Freedom of Religion on Public Lands: Devils Tower and the Protection of Indian Sacred Sites. *Environmental Affairs Law Review* 27: 307-339.

Littlejohn, Margaret

- 1991 *Visitor Services Project Report 35: Glacier National Park*. University of Idaho. http://psu.uidaho.edu/files/vsp/reports/35_GLAC_rept.pdf, accessed March 2, 2011.

Low, Setha M.

- 2008 Social Sustainability: People, History, and Values. In *The Heritage Reader*. Graham Fairclough, Rodney Harrison, John H. Jameson Jr., and John Schofield, eds. Pp. 392-404. New York: Routledge.

Lowenthal, David

- 1968 The American Scene. *Geographical Review* 58 (1): 61-88.

Manni, Marc F; Margret Littlejohn, Jessica Evans, James Gramann, Steven J. Hollenhorst

- 2007 *Visitor Services Project Report 178: Yellowstone National Park*. University of Idaho. http://psu.uidaho.edu/files/vsp/reports/178_YELL_rept.pdf, accessed September 20, 2011.

Marcucci, Daniel J.

- 2000 Landscape History as a Planning Tool. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 49: 67-81.

McCool, Stephen F. and Neal A. Christensen

- 1996 Alleviating Congestion in Parks and Recreation Areas Through Direct Management of Visitor Behavior. In *Crowding and Congestion in the National Park System: Guidelines for Management and Research*, D.W. Lime, ed. Pp. 67-83. St. Paul: MAES Misc. Pub. 86-1996.

McGlade, James

- 1999 Archaeology and the Evolution of Cultural Landscapes: Towards an Interdisciplinary Research Agenda. In *The Archaeology and Anthropology of Landscape: Shaping Your Landscape*. Peter J. Ucko and Robert Layton, eds. Pp. 458-482. London: Routledge.

Mitchell, Nora and Susan Buggey

- 2000 Protected Landscapes and Cultural Landscapes: Taking Advantage of Diverse Approaches. *The George Wright Forum* 17(1): 35-46.

Morphy, Howard

- 1993 Colonialism, History and the Construction of Place: The Politics of Landscape in Northern Australia. In *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*. Barbara Bender, ed. Pp. 205-244. Providence: Berg.

Muir, Richard

- 1996 Figures in the Landscape. *Landscapes: Perception, Recognition and Management-Reconciling the Impossible? Conference Proceedings* April 2-4. Melvyn Jones and Ian D. Rotherham, eds. Pp. 1-6. Sheffield: Wildtrack Publishing.
- 1999 *Approaches to Landscape*. London: MacMillan Press Ltd.

Myers, F.

- 1982 Always Ask: Resource Use and Land Ownership Among Pintupi Aborigines of the Australian Western Desert. In *Resource Managers: North American and Australian Hunter-Gatherers*. N. Williams and E. Hunn, eds. Pp. 173-195. AAAS: Washington, DC.

Newman, Richard

- 1996 Historic Cultural Landscapes: Recognition, Definition, and Classification within the Planning Process. *Landscapes: Perception, Recognition and Management-Reconciling the Impossible? Conference Proceedings* April 2-4. Melvyn Jones and Ian D. Rotherham, eds. Pp. 94-98. Sheffield: Wildtrack Publishing.

NPS-National Park Service

- 1992 *National Historic Preservation Act of 1966: As amended through 1992*. <http://www.nps.gov/history/local-law/nhpa1966.htm>, accessed December 4, 2009.
- 2006 *Management Policies 2006: The guide to managing the National Park System*. <http://www.nps.gov/policy/mp/policies.htm>, accessed November 1, 2009.
- 2007a *Glacier's Guiding Principles*. Electronic document, http://www.nps.gov/glac/forteachers/glacier_principles.htm, accessed October 7, 2009.
- 2007b *Fort Yellowstone Historic District*. <http://www.nps.gov/yell/historyculture/ftyell.htm>, accessed September 28, 2011.
- 2008 *Devils Tower No-Fly Advisory Zone*. <http://www.nps.gov/deto/planyourvisit/noflyadvisory.htm>, accessed February 4, 2011.
- 2010 *Devils Tower National Monument*. <http://www.nps.gov/deto/>, accessed January 31, 2011.

O'Brien, Bob R.

- 1999 *Our National Parks and the Search for Sustainability*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Patterson, Thomas C

- 2008 The History of Landscape Archaeology in the Americas. In *Handbook of Landscape Archaeology*, Bruno David and Julian Thomas, eds. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press Inc.

Philips, Adrian

- 2005 Landscape as a Meeting Ground: Category V Protected Landscapes/Seascapes and World Heritage Cultural Landscapes. In *The Protected Landscape Approach: Linking Nature, Culture and Community*. Jessica Brown, Nora Mitchell, and Michael Beresford, eds. Pp. 19-36. Cambridge: ICUN.

Reeves, Brian O.K.

- 1994 Ninaistákiis –The Nitsitapii's Sacred Mountain: Traditional Native religious activities and land use/tourism conflicts. In *Sacred Sites, Sacred Places*, D.L. Carmichael, J. Hubert, B. Reeves, and A. Schanche, eds. Pp. 265-295. London: Routledge.
- 2003 *Mistakis: The archaeology of Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park*. Montana State University in Bozeman and the National Park Service.

Reeves, Brian and Sandra Peacock

- 2001 *Our Mountains Are Our Pillows: An ethnographic overview of Glacier National Park*. Montana: Glacier National Park.

Richards, Thomas

- 2008 *Survey Strategies in Landscape Archaeology*. In *Handbook of Landscape Archaeology*. Bruno David and Julian Thomas. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press Inc.

Rogers, Jeanne

- 2007 *Standing Witness: Devils Tower National Monument, A History*. Devils Tower National Monument: National Park Service.

Rogers, Jerry L.

- 1993 The Perspective of the United States National Park Service. In *Kunaitupii: Coming Together on Native Sacred Sites*, B.O.K. Reeves and M.A. Kennedy, eds. Pp. 136-139. Calgary: Archaeological Society of Alberta.

Shanks, Michael and Christopher Tilley

- 1987 *Social Theory and Archaeology*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico.

Smith, Laurajane

- 2004 *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*. New York: Routledge.

Teeman, Diane L.

- 2008 Cultural resource management and the Protection of Valued Tribal Spaces: A View from the Western United States. In *Handbook of Landscape Archaeology*. Bruno David and Julian Thomas, eds. Pp. 626-632. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press Inc.

Thomas, Julian

- 1993 The Politics of Vision and the Archaeologies of Landscape. In *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*. Barbara Bender, ed. pp. 19-48. Providence: Berg.

Trigger, Bruce G.

- 1996 *A History of Archaeological Thought*. 2nd Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tsosie, Rebecca

- 1997 Indigenous Rights and Archaeology. In *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground*. Nina Swidler, Kurt E. Dongoske, Rodger Anyon, and Alan S. Downer, eds. Pp. 64-76. Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press.

Turner, Sam and Graham Fairclough

- 2007 Common Culture: The Archaeology of Landscape Character in Europe. In *Envisioning Landscape: Situations and Standpoints in Archaeology and Heritage*. Dan Hicks, Laura McAtackney, and Graham Fairclough, eds. Pp. 120-145. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Tveit, Mari Sundli

- 2006 Nature Meets Aesthetics on Cultural Grounds: A Multidisciplinary Study of Grave Mounds in Norway. In *From Landscape Research to Landscape Planning: Aspects of Integration, Education, and Application*. Barbel Tress, Gunther Tress, Gary Fry, and Paul Opdam, eds. Pp. 293-304. Netherlands: Springer.

UNESCO-United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization

- 2011 *Cultural Landscape*. <http://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/477/#1>. Accessed October 1, 2011.

University of Idaho

- 2008 *Serving the Visitor 2008: A Report on Visitors to the National Park System*. University of Idaho Park Studies Unit. <http://www.psu.uidaho.edu/files/vsp/STV08.pdf>. Accessed March 2, 2011.

Vander Stoep, Gail A. and Joesph W. Roggenbuck

- 1996 Is Your Park Being “Loved to Death?” Using Communications and Other Indirect Techniques to Battle the Park “Love Bug.” In *Crowding and Congestion in the National Park System: Guidelines for Management and Research*, D.W. Lime, ed. Pp. 85-132. St Paul: MAES Misc. Pub. 86-1996.

White Deer, Gary

- 1997 Return of the Sacred: Spirituality and that Scientific Imperative. In *Native Americans and Archaeologists: Stepping Stones to Common Ground*. Nina Swidler, Kurt E. Dongoske, Rodger Anyon, and Alan S. Downer, eds. Pp. 37-43. Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press.

Willey, Gordon R.

- 1953 Prehistoric Settlement Patterns in the Virú Valley, Peru. *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin* 155. Smithsonian Institution: Washington, DC.

Zimmerman, Larry J.

- 2005 First, Be Humble: Working with Indigenous Peoples and Other Descendant Communities. In *Indigenous Archaeologies: Decolonizing Theory and Practice*. Claire Smith and H. Martin Wobst, eds. Pp. 301-314. London: Routledge.